

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 26428) for the relief of Sophia Herbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 26429) granting a pension to Francis P. McCue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26430) granting a pension to Hale F. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26431) granting a pension to James M. Ballard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26432) granting a pension to Thomas Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26433) granting a pension to Lionelle Gottschall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26434) granting a pension to Dock Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26435) granting a pension to David Kauffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26436) granting a pension to Fredrica Wurthner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26437) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Gear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26438) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26439) granting an increase of pension to George W. Laughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26440) granting an increase of pension to Philip Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 26441) granting pensions to Henrietta Howell Ray and Maria Correll Ray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 26442) for the relief of Phillip McCormick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 26443) for the relief of Charles F. Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 26444) granting an increase of pension to Kate D. Linsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 26445) granting an increase of pension to John Birkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 26448) granting a pension to Nellie P. Dertinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 26449) for the relief of Harvey W. Lane; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the International Typographical Union, at Cleveland, Ohio, against freighting second-class matter and increase in rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Business Men's League of St. Louis, Mo., against passage of the Kenyon bill (S. 4043); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of Ferdinand Gutmann & Co., of New York, protesting against the passage of the Kenyon bill (S. 4043); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the openers and packers of the United States appraisers' stores, port of New York, asking an increase in the salaries; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany House bill 26303, for the relief of the American Fire Insurance Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PALMER: Memorial of South Easton Council, No. 590, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Easton, Pa., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Department of Peace and Arbitration of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring passage of joint resolution 335, relative to peace conference in 1915; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the chambers of commerce of New Haven, Conn.; Seattle, Wash.; Sedalia, Mo.; Savannah, Ga.; San Jose, Cal.; Trenton, N. J.; Sacramento and Los Angeles, Cal.; Norfolk, Va.; and Washington, D. C.; and the governors of Kentucky, Arizona, Texas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Nebraska, Alabama, Alaska, Michigan, Colorado, Connecticut, Virginia, Ohio, and Wyoming, favoring passage of House bill 19224, relative to permanent exhibit of the resources of the States of the Union; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of Ferdinand Gutmann & Co., of New York City, against passage of the Kenyon bill (S. 4043); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, August 26, 1912.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

Mr. GALLINGER took the chair as President pro tempore under the previous order of the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the Journal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah objects. The reading will be continued.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

SENATORS FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 386.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I understand the unfinished business before the Senate is the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill, and that the pending motion is the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to recede from the Senate amendments. That motion has not yet been disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business is really the morning business. The Chair thinks the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is undoubtedly in order under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. I only wanted to see that we did not lose track of the latter matter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Since making the suggestion, the Chair recalls the fact that there is a rule of the Senate to this effect:

RULE VII.

3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. When I rose, Mr. President, no Senator had claimed or sought to claim the floor for the purpose of introducing morning business; and I assumed, and I assume now, that there is no morning business to present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the duty of the Chair, however, to call for morning business, if the Senator please, and under this rule of the Senate—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If there is any morning business, I withhold my motion until that is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Petitions and memorials are in order; and the Chair presents a petition from the governor of West Virginia and certain other citizens of that State relating to the election of the Senators from West Virginia, which will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE. What is the nature of that petition, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can only be developed by its reading.

Mr. PENROSE. Then, I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks that the petition be read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the petition will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the petition.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask what is the paper which is being read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a petition signed by the governor of West Virginia and other citizens of that State addressed to the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has asked that it be read, and unanimous consent was given for the reading.

Mr. WARREN. I was not making any objection. I simply wanted to know, as we went along, what was being done. My attention was diverted for the moment.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the petition.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, when I inadvertently asked to have this document read, I did not know the subject to which it referred, and, to tell the truth, as is well known in the Senate, it was desired at this time to delay the proceedings a little until certain conferences might be held, with a view of having some of the difficulties incident to the deficiency bill adjusted in order to expedite the adjournment of Congress. I

now withdraw my request to have the document read and ask that it be not printed in the RECORD but be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The reading of the document has almost been concluded. It has gone so far as to disclose the most serious charges against Members of this body. It seems to me the honor of the Senate would require that the reading be proceeded with and that the matter be investigated. I do not believe charges of this kind can be rendered harmless or be disposed of by being suppressed. They ought to be given publicity, and I request that the reading be continued—I understand it is almost completed—and that the document be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to inquire of the Senator who presented that petition.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The governor of the State did.

Mr. OVERMAN. But the Senate is about to adjourn, and while I do not object to documents being presented—

Mr. PENROSE. I do not object to the document being read, of course, especially as its reading has been nearly completed. When I made my suggestion just now, I thought perhaps there was a good deal more of it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Only now six or eight lines.

Mr. PENROSE. That is all right. I want to finish my explanation if the Chair will permit me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading will be concluded.

Mr. PENROSE. May I conclude my statement?

I had been advised that the difficulties relating to the deficiency bill had been adjusted, and I simply rose to save the time of the Senate. If the reading of the document is nearly finished, let it be completed and let the document be referred to the committee, and, of course, investigated. I only wanted to explain to the Senate again that I know nothing of the document; I never heard of it before and would not have consumed the time of the Senate with its reading, which is not entirely regular, had it not been that I wanted to consume a little time until conferences could be completed, and thought some document would be good to read.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should have objected to the reading of it and to its being printed in the RECORD if I had known its contents, because I do not believe that any man ought to be permitted to spread such accusations against a fellow man, Senator or not a Senator, upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until he has presented some evidence in support of them. The orderly way would have been for this memorial to have gone to the committee, and after the committee had determined for itself whether there was any probability that these charges could be supported, then reported it to the Senate, either recommending an investigation or giving its opinion that an investigation was not necessary.

I think the Senate will set a dangerous precedent whenever it advertises to the world that the most reckless and irresponsible man may sit down and indict any Member of this body in language of the coarsest and most brutal kind and have it printed as a public record.

I want to say besides, Mr. President, without desiring to challenge the action of the Presiding Officer, that, in my opinion, no memorial can be presented to the Senate in the way this has been presented. My opinion is that a memorial can only be presented to the Senate by a Senator, and that John Smith or Bill Jones can not be permitted to vent their spleen against somebody by sending it to the Chair. If a Senator presents it he presents it on his responsibility as a Senator, as a matter of course. It seems to me that this is a grossly improper proceeding.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I only desire to add a word. Of course, I have no desire to suppress this or any other document. I simply wanted in a way to apologize to the Senate for having asked for a proceeding which is irregular and unnecessary, and to state that the reason therefor was to give a few minutes longer for a conference that was being held in the cloakroom. I understand that this document, as a matter of fact, has been given to the press or will be given to the press and there is no secrecy about it. It is simply a matter of maintaining the regular course of procedure.

Mr. BAILEY. It is a matter not in the ordinary course of business; there is not any justification for it. I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have no desire to suppress any document which is supported by even a reasonable show of proof, but I would suppress an unwarranted attack upon the humblest citizen of the Republic.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not mean to imply for a moment that the Senator did not want a full investigation of the matter.

Mr. BAILEY. I would exclude this memorial until these memorialists can show that there is some reasonable expectation

of supporting their charges. I do not believe in indiscriminate charges. I venture to say that there is not a Senator in this body against whom charges of misconduct have not been made, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred those charges were without foundation, or certainly in a large majority of the cases.

I have no interest in it, but with precedent established the Senate, if the present distemper of the public mind continues, will from day to day sit here and hear every Member arraigned in this way. If there are guilty ones they ought not to be protected, and I assume that the Committee on Privileges and Elections will not protect them, but I do insist that before any man, governor, as seems to be the case here, or anyone, shall be permitted to incorporate in the permanent records of this country a violent attack upon the character and integrity of his fellow man, he should first offer some proof in support of his charge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In justification of the action the Chair took, the action of the Chair having been challenged and pronounced irregular—

Mr. BAILEY. Hardly challenged, but criticized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to Rule VII, which says:

After the Journal is read the Presiding Officer shall lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate.

The Chair found a document, in the nature of a petition, before him addressed to the Senate of the United States, signed by the governor of a State and several other presumably reputable citizens, which was laid before the Senate that it might be referred to the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. As I said, I did not intend to challenge the action of the Chair, though I did venture to criticize it as unwarranted by the rule. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that following the language which he has just read, the next sentence begins: "The Presiding Officer shall then call for, in the following order, the presentation of petitions and memorials." If petitions and memorials were included in the other, then they need not to have been enumerated in what follows, and I think the rule contemplates only that the Presiding Officer shall lay before the Senate such communications as are properly addressed to him.

Mr. WARREN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with what the Senator is saying about the propriety of printing, and I would not resist a motion to expunge it from the RECORD. I think, however, that it would excite more curiosity if it were left out than if it were printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BAILEY. I interpose only to protest against the practice. Enough has already been said to make it evident that the Senate is being used now merely to further a campaign of publicity. We have already been told that this matter has been given to the press. I think, however, the country will not omit to take notice of the fact that although these alleged occurrences took place two years ago, the honorable governor of the State, whose dignity has thus been outraged, waits not only two years, but waits until the very day before the Senate adjourns, and except for an extraordinary situation which arose Saturday night it would have been too late to have reached the Senate until after its adjournment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks in justice to the Chair the statement made ought to be supplemented by the suggestion that this was in the nature of a communication addressed to the President pro tempore, and there are thousands of precedents to sustain the action of the Chair. The Chair hopes that the action taken will not be found to be either in violation of the rules of the Senate or the proprieties of the occasion. If the Chair had suppressed the document, it would have been a very serious matter, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, as I understand the rule, it was the duty of the Chair to lay the matter before the Senate and have it referred to the proper committee. I think the Chair was not only justified in so doing but he was following the rules which he is bound himself to enforce.

But, Mr. President, I think the request for its reading was made under a misapprehension as to what it was, and I think there went into the RECORD certain matters that ought not to be printed in a public and permanent RECORD. Therefore I move that such portions of the matter as have been already read shall be expunged from the RECORD, and that the reading go no further.

Mr. BACON. And that the document be referred to the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly. That was a part of the statement of the Chair, as I understood it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota moves that the entire matter be expunged from the Record?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what I move. Of course, none of it would go into the Record in any case except what had been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota moves that everything relating to this matter except the presentation of the document by the Presiding Officer and its reference to a committee be expunged from the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely want to say that the statement I make is made from recollection, but I believe that the basis for the investigation in the Lorimer case was a communication signed by the president of a voters' league in the State of Illinois and that it was much more vague and indefinite than this communication from the governor of the State of West Virginia. I do not recall that it contained any specific statement of fact, but a general statement that the seat of the Senator from Illinois had been secured through corrupt influences. That is my recollection of it. I remember the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] presented the communication to the Senate.

It seems to me that this document, Mr. President, coming as it does from the governor of the State, containing specific allegations, is a much more responsible document upon which to base a proceeding on the part of the Committee on Privileges and Elections than the document which was presented by the senior Senator from Illinois in the Lorimer case, and followed at once by a resolution for an investigation on the part of the committee.

I am corrected, Mr. President, in my recollection by the senior Senator from Illinois, who says that the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lorimer, himself offered the resolution for the investigation upon the presentation of the charges made in that communication addressed to the senior Senator.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, neither of the West Virginia Senators is present. The junior Senator [Mr. CHILTON] is sick and absent by leave of the Senate, and the senior Senator [Mr. WATSON] is absent and his absence was properly accounted for in the Senate by the announcement already made.

I simply rose to say that I am quite sure neither of the Senators will in the slightest manner endeavor to prevent any investigation which the Senate may desire to make as to the circumstances attending their election. On the contrary, I am very certain they will welcome anything of the kind, as there is nothing to be apprehended by them in the investigation.

The fact mentioned by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] is one which I had previously risen to call to the attention of the Senate, and I will add only a word or two to what has already been stated by him. It is that these alleged occurrences are nearly 2 years old, and since then, during the last 20 months, the Senate has been in almost continuous session. With the exception of, I think, three months and a fraction the Senate has been in continuous session since last January a year ago; and while there were whisperings around about these matters, accompanied at that time by the expressions of these Senators that they were absolutely indifferent to any assaults of that kind which might be made and perfectly ready to receive them when made, and to answer them fully and effectually and conclusively, there has not been the slightest presentation of the matter to the Senate or the slightest movement in that direction until the last day of the present session, when the governor who now comes so courageously to the front knew they were both absent from the Chamber, and at a time when, unless there had been what really was almost an accident in the unforeseen development of differences between the two Houses Saturday night, the Senate would not have been in session at all. And now it is presented at a time when it is known absolutely and certainly to the author of the paper that an investigation would be an impossibility. It was manifestly the design to have these baseless and scandalous charges presented to the Senate and published to the country in such manner that there would be no opportunity to either answer them on the floor of the Senate or to have a committee of this body, by an investigation, brand them as false and malicious; and when—

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. BACON. Let me finish this sentence.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. And when thus knowing it would be an absolute impossibility to make such investigation and make a finding and report, he could have had no motive but to spread this slander upon these Senators, upon the public records, and to scatter it in the public prints for the purpose of influencing an election in a coming campaign.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, if the Senator will permit me, I have just examined the date of it. I find it dated Charleston,

W. Va., on the 26th day of August, which is to-day, obviously written and sent out on Sunday.

Mr. BACON. I have listened to the reading, it is true, but I could not catch it as accurately as I would do if I had it before me for reading with the eye, but according to the hearing which I was enabled to give it they are charges of the vaguest and most indefinite character. While they are broad, they are without any specifications whatever of anything which would amount to anything. There is no charge made of any corrupt vote received by either of these Senators and no charge of any corruption or knowledge of any corruption by either of them. It is a well-known fact that when these charges were made in West Virginia nearly two years ago the evidence presented to sustain them was recognized as not only false, but ridiculous. All the circumstances of the presentation of this memorial show beyond the shadow of a doubt that it is not made in good faith.

Can anybody who is a sane man believe that in a State like West Virginia, a closely contested political State, that if since last January a year ago, with the Senate in almost continuous session during all that time, there had been any ground for the belief that the seat of either Senator from West Virginia had been procured by bribery, that matter would have been permitted to have rested from then until this good day without agitation and without any effort whatever to have an investigation as to the truth of the charge?

Mr. President, not only is West Virginia a State closely contested between the two great national political parties, but it is also closely contested between factions of the Democratic Party of that State. We have some little mention in this memorial which makes some suggestions in regard to the fact that there are factions there in the Democratic Party. Does anybody believe for a moment that if there had been any foundation for these charges, with not only antagonisms and issues which arise between the great political parties, but with also the antagonisms and issues which arise between factions of the Democratic Party, that that matter would have been allowed to sleep until now? What possible purpose, Mr. President, could there be in the presentation of this paper, except to make use of it in a political campaign?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. Pardon me a second. What purpose could possibly have been had in the presentation of this paper after this long silence in the presence of the known fact that in presenting it now, in the very hour of adjournment, nothing could be accomplished by its author except to spread slander and libel at a time when refutation by the Senate was not practicable, or when, at least, no such investigation could be given to it as would give opportunity for the answer of this body, which, I am sure, would be given, if I am correctly informed as to the facts and as to the utter falsity of these charges?

Mr. President, I would not myself vote to expunge the matter which has been read if so doing would keep it from the public, but we are told that the matter is already given in the press, so that there is no suppression of any allegations which would be made in regard to it. There is no need to suppress them, because, if the reports generally credited are true, the more public these charges may be made the more certainly will they be shown to be false and malicious.

I myself care very little as to the question of printing this memorial in the Record, except for our own credit as to whether we will permit slander and libel to be promoted by such means as those to which I have alluded, permitting them to be incorporated in the Record. Those who love muckraking will have ample opportunity to gratify their tastes by reading it in the papers, in which it will be published. That is the only motive I would have in excluding it, because, of course, I have no doubt the same motive which caused this paper to be sent here will cause it to be spread in all the newspapers of the country, and there is going to be no suppression either of the memorial or of any allegation of its being excluded from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The exclusion of this from the Record is not the purpose of my remarks. I wished only to emphasize the fact that this has been sent here under these circumstances on the last day of the session, and in the last hour, practically, of the session, when it was known absolutely and certainly by the author that an investigation was an impossibility, when he could have had no purpose to try to accomplish anything in the way of investigation, and when his sole purpose must have been simply to take advantage of the opportunity to put these foul and slanderous matters in a way to be used in a political campaign.

Mr. President, if I heard the reading correctly—

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to suggest that possibly one purpose in presenting this matter at this time, or one thing that would be accomplished if it goes into the Record, is that it then becomes frankable and can be sent free broadcast over West Virginia and elsewhere in the country.

Mr. BACON. That may have been the purpose of sending it here on the last day of the session. That was doubtless one feature of the general scheme to use the presentation of the paper as a memorial for the purpose of using it to further a political campaign.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WORKS. I thought the Senator from Georgia had yielded the floor.

Mr. BACON. I will yield the floor, Mr. President, just with one word. All of us from every motive desire that any well-founded charge against any Member of this body should be sifted to the bottom and the truth ascertained, and nothing which I have said is to be construed to the contrary of that. These two Senators have been with us now for all this time. They are among our most useful and our most honored Members. They have been here standing all this time in a position to be challenged, if anybody knew aught against them personally or officially, and nothing has been said. I do not question the fact that the whole thing which has moved this has been the unworthy purpose to besmirch men's characters for the purpose of accomplishing political ends. There is no higher duty than to expose and condemn political corruption. But there is no fouler act than to falsely besmirch private or official character for the purpose of gaining political advantage.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I think the Chair was not only justified but was required by the rules of the Senate to submit this question. I think it was a mistake that it should have been read to the Senate, but I think it would be a much greater mistake if we should now attempt to suppress it. The facts that are contained in the petition will go to the country; that can not be avoided; and if this action is taken, in addition to that it will go out to the country that the Senate of the United States undertook to suppress these charges by its action and to conceal them.

It is unfortunate that the Senators who are directly interested in this matter are not here to say for themselves what they desire with respect to it; but if it were I and these charges had been presented in the Senate and had been read, I should ask the Senate of the United States not to suppress or to expunge them from its record. Not only do I think it would be unjust to the Senators themselves to take that action, but I think it would be unjust to the Senate of the United States.

With the comments that have been made upon the presentation of this petition and the manner in which it is brought before the Senate, it is not so likely to injure the Senators who are directly interested in it as would the act that is now proposed, to suppress it entirely. I think, Mr. President, it would be a great mistake and an injustice to the Senators who are interested in this question and the charges that are made. I hope the Senate will not take that action.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, my motion is based upon my objection that our Record should be made the cesspool for the lodgment of the virus of all such political malcontents.

The Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] is greatly in error if he understands this to be a matter of suppression. I have not asked that the instrument itself be suppressed; but I do believe, Mr. President, that we should not make the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the purveyor or the container of any scurrilous matter against any person on the initiative of some one outside of the Senate who might send it here until after the matter itself has been investigated. My motion does not suppress the article; it sends it to the proper committee; and if the proper committee shall find that there is any justification for an investigation along this line, then the matter will come back to the Senate and the whole thing will go upon record; but it ought not to be spread at length upon record until some reasonable case has been made after an investigation by a proper committee.

Mr. BAILEY. And anyone can then go to the committee room and get a copy of it. There is no possible suppression.

Mr. McCUMBER. It can be obtained if we want to make it public. My objection is not that the press of the country shall not get hold of it, but that this calumny shall not be placed upon the character of these men by printing it in the RECORD until we have some more evidence than a mere statement.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I did not mean to intimate that the Senator from North Dakota was attempting improperly to

suppress any part of the proceedings of the Senate or that the Senate itself was desirous of taking any such action; but we may say what we please, it will be so construed by the country. It has in fact by the action of the Senate now become a part of the records. Having become a part of the records by the action of the Senate, it can only be excluded from the RECORD by affirmative action of the Senate. That being so, it is an act of suppression, call it what we may; and I think it would be a very unfortunate thing to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the motion made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that the matter be expunged from the records of the Senate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that neither of the Senators from West Virginia is here, it seems to me that it would be doing them a great injustice to take any action whatever which even had the appearance of trying to avoid or evade or suppress the fact of these charges. The charges have been made, of course we know nothing about the proof which is capable of being produced to support them; but the investigation will disclose that.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and others have called attention to the circumstances under which the petition was introduced as tending to discredit it. If their suspicion is well founded, an investigation will disclose it. There is not a Senator here, I imagine, who, if these charges were presented against him, would not instantly ask for the fullest publicity and ask for an investigation. I have seen Members of the other House and of the Senate when informal charges and informal insinuations and newspaper editorials were brought to their notice, rise to questions of personal privilege and themselves read the charges into the Record and ask for an investigation. I know personally very well one of the Senators from West Virginia, and am on the friendliest terms with him—I refer to the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. CHILTON—and if he were here I am sure he would resent any attempt to suppress this petition or to keep it out of the Record or to prevent the fullest publicity. Believing so, I think the motion of the Senator from North Dakota ought not to be adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I merely desire to say a very few words. A petition of this sort, coming to the Senate under ordinary circumstances, should not only be presented but it ought to be read; but this petition comes here discredited; it comes here at a time and under circumstances when there is no possible escape from the conviction that it was sent here for ulterior purposes. It is intended for muckraking campaign purposes. I am sure that neither of the Senators from West Virginia desires to suppress anything. I think it is almost certain that if either one of them were here, he would demand that it be read, so far as he personally was concerned; but for my part, as a Member of this body, I object to thus dignifying a paper coming here under the circumstances and at the time this paper comes, when it is perfectly clear that it was sent for dishonest and improper purposes and designed as a slanderous attack on the reputation of Senators solely for political purposes. Therefore as a Member of this body I object to having a paper coming here discredited and under the circumstances attending its introduction dignified by being inserted in the RECORD and the RECORD being made a vehicle for the circulation of a vicious attack made under improper circumstances and for campaign purposes. For those reasons I hope the motion of the Senator from North Dakota will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a word, Mr. President. Under the rules of the Senate no Senator here has any right to make a statement against the character and standing of another Senator. Has a person outside of the Senate any greater right than have Senators on the floor to put into the RECORD defamatory matter, without the right of a committee of the Senate to first pass upon that matter? I almost resent the appellation "suppression." No one has asked that anything be suppressed. All we have asked is that this indictment, coming from an outside source, should not be spread upon the records of the Senate until a committee can pass upon the propriety of making it a public record here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota that the matter be expunged from the RECORD.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, returned to the Senate the bill (S. 4862) for the relief of certain persons having supplied labor and materials for the prosecution of the work of constructing the Corbett Tunnel of the Shoshone irrigation project, and accompanying papers, it having failed to pass the House of Representatives over the veto of the President.

CAPT. JOSEPH HERRING—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 950).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without approval, Senate bill No. 67, entitled "An act for the relief of Capt. Joseph Herring, United States Army, retired," for the reasons stated in the accompanying letters from the Secretary of War and memorandum of the Commissary General of the Army.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 24, 1912.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the message and accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on Claims and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

LANDS AT OKANOGAN, WASH.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a bill was passed a short time ago and approved by the President on July 22. In a communication sent by the Department of the Interior describing the land, the words "township 23" were used instead of "township 33." The bill passed with the township designated in that way. It has since been found that there was an error on the part of the department. It should have been "township 33" instead of "township 23." I introduce a bill to amend the act that has been passed by striking out "twenty-three" and inserting "thirty-three." I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I will say that I have examined the records in the department and found that the mistake was made there.

The bill (S. 7500) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes," approved July 22, 1912, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes," approved July 22, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out in the first section thereof, in the description of the lands authorized to be sold, the word "twenty-three," after the word "township," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty-three."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 7501) granting an increase of pension to Lurinda P. Barnes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

VIOLATIONS OF THE ANTITRUST ACT.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the following House concurrent resolution (No. 63), reported it favorably, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 25,000 copies of the majority and minority reports of the committee authorized, under House resolution 148, to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890 and other acts be printed for the use of the House, 15,000 to be distributed through the folding room and 10,000 through the document room.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15626) to provide for the proper deed of conveyance to real estate in the District of Columbia when the United States contributes to its purchase or condemnation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to House concurrent resolution 65 authorizing the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on the 25th day of August, 1912, at 3 o'clock a. m.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 7500. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to

the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public park purposes," approved July 22, 1912; and

H. R. 25970. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 and for prior years, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had, on the 26th instant, approved and signed the following act:

S. 7500. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes," approved July 22, 1912.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The following bill of the House of Representatives was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 15626. An act to provide for the proper deed of conveyance to real estate in the District of Columbia when the United States contributes to its purchase or condemnation.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 386.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask leave to amend the resolution by striking out, on line 15, page 1, the words "Members of" and inserting in lieu thereof "Representatives in."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I also ask unanimous consent to amend by inserting after the word "and," on the same page, the words "Members of."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that the amendment inserting the word "reputable," before the word "attorneys," might be construed by malicious persons as reflecting on the good faith and credit of the committee. Of course I had no such thought, and I ask to withdraw that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania moves to amend by striking from the resolution the word "reputable," before the word "attorneys." The Chair is informed that that amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. I rose to ask the Chair whether the several amendments offered by me on yesterday have yet been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed—the Chair was laboring under a misapprehension—that the amendment has not been agreed to, and is now pending. The Senator modifies it by striking from the proposed amendment the word "reputable," and the amendment will be reported.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the word "attorney" and insert the word "attorneys."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the resolution the following words:

And that any parties to the examination may be represented by attorneys if they so desire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. I suggest that the whole resolution, which is rather an important one, be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator ask that the resolution as amended be read?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Looking at the line which was amended a moment ago, I think I prefer to leave in the word "and"; simply insert a comma between "Members of" and "and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that change will be made. The resolution as amended will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the statement made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. PENROSE, in the Senate on Wednesday, August 21, 1912, be, and is hereby, referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, appointed under S. Res. 79, agreed to on April 29, 1912.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate fully into all statements and questions of fact referred to in the statement of personal privilege made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. PENROSE, on the floor of the Senate, August 21, 1912; including all correspondence and financial transactions between John D. Archbold and George W. Perkins and Col. Theodore Roosevelt and Representatives in Congress and Members of the United States Senate from 1900 to the date of the investigation; and further, said committee is authorized and directed to investigate into and ascertain the amounts of money expended by or on behalf of any candidate seeking the nomination of any political party formed or in the process of formation for President during the year

1912, or by any committee or person acting for or on behalf of such candidate, or in the interest of such candidate or party; and to ascertain the names of all persons, firms, or corporations contributing to any of the purposes aforesaid, and the amounts paid or contributed, and how and when paid, including all sums of money used to secure the election of delegates to any national convention or to influence the actions of delegates at said convention.

Said committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate, and during any recess of the Senate or of Congress, and to hold sessions at such place or places as may be deemed most convenient for the purposes of the inquiry; to employ attorneys, stenographers, and such other clerical force as may be deemed necessary; to subpoena witnesses; send for persons, books, records, and papers; and to administer oaths, and any parties to the examination may be represented by attorneys if they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. CLAPP. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to a provision there that strikes me as liable to result in almost indefinite delay. I refer to the provision that parties in interest may be represented by attorneys. It is left to the committee to determine whether the committee shall employ attorneys or not, but if every witness the committee calls is entitled to have an attorney, considering the right of a witness with respect to time and likewise the convenience of attorneys, with no discretion in the committee, it strikes me that it will lead to a prolongation and indefinite enlargement of the record of the hearing. I simply make the suggestion. I do not propose to combat anything. I favor the general scope of the resolution.

Mr. PENROSE. This is not an uncommon practice. I believe there were attorneys in the Ballinger investigation and in many other investigations. I think, however, the committee can regulate the matter very well. It can pass rules and regulations as to how these attorneys shall appear, and in what number. It is largely under the control of the committee, I think.

Mr. CLAPP. That is the trouble. In other cases that have been before the Senate, at one time an official was involved, at another time it referred more especially to a particular person. In this resolution there is the right to every single witness to have an attorney.

Mr. PENROSE. I will modify it and say that parties to the examination may employ attorneys, subject to the rules and regulations of the committee.

Mr. CLAPP. "May be represented by attorneys."

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; subject to the rules and regulations which it may establish.

Mr. CLAPP. That would be all right.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, as he is chairman of the subcommittee, to the language of this resolution. The statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is referred to the "Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate or any subcommittee thereof appointed under Senate resolution 79, agreed to on April 29."

Now, then, follows the declaration—

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed—

And so on.

Which subcommittee has authority; how many subcommittees have authority?

Mr. BAILEY. The subcommittee.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course I had observed that there was some confusion in the language, but I take it for granted that the resolution refers to the subcommittee appointed under Senate resolution 79.

Mr. CULBERSON. The resolution says this statement is referred to the full committee or any subcommittee. Which reference is it—to the full committee or the subcommittee?

Mr. CLAPP. Right there, it goes on to say, as I recall it—I have not a copy of it—or any subcommittee appointed under Senate resolution 79.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes. All I wanted to do was to invite the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to this confusion of language, so that it might be cleared up and made clear.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me? That portion of the resolution comprises the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I recognize that the language, while not vague or obscure, was not such as it should be; but as it is his amendment, I did not want to interfere with it. I do not think there will be any trouble in conducting the investigation as the resolution is worded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the resolution, the words:

And that parties to the examination may be represented by attorneys, subject to such rules and regulations as the committee may make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that modification will be made.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, Saturday afternoon, in a brief statement to the Senate, I declared that I would not support

this resolution in so far as it related to the election of presidential or vice presidential electors or the nomination of candidates for President or Vice President, because under the Constitution of the United States Congress has no power over the election of a President or Vice President and has no power to regulate the election of electors.

I do not believe any Senator has ventured on the floor of the Senate to challenge that construction of the Constitution. But Senators have suggested, in the cloakroom and elsewhere, that I must be in error in that contention, and I ask the indulgence of the Senate for only such time as will enable me to incorporate in the RECORD an extract from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I incorporate that extract so that the Senate may see that if I am in wrong I have been misled by that great court.

Years ago, in the State of Virginia, a man by the name of Green was indicted for casting an illegal and corrupt ballot in the election of presidential and vice presidential electors. He sought to avoid a conviction under that indictment by challenging the law of the State and declaring that if he was indictable at all it was under the Federal law, as he had cast his vote for a Federal officer. That case came to the Supreme Court of the United States, and this is what the court said in answer to that contention:

Although the electors are appointed and act under and pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, they are no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as electors of Representatives in Congress.

Subsequently, in the Michigan case, where it was contended that the law of Michigan providing for the election of electors by districts was in contravention of the Constitution of the United States, the court uses this language:

In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States. They are, as remarked by Mr. Justice Gray in *In re Green* (134 U. S., 377, 379), "no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as the electors of Representatives in Congress." Congress is empowered to determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they are to give their votes, which is required to be the same day throughout the United States; but otherwise the power and jurisdiction of the State is exclusive, with the exception of the provisions as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons, so framed that congressional and Federal influence might be excluded.

The question before us is not one of policy, but of power.

So, Mr. President, I submit that while it is entirely competent for the Senate to pursue the investigation with reference to Senators, and I think it is entirely competent for the House to pursue any investigation it chooses with respect to Members of the House, and it is certainly competent and proper for the Senate to call for any papers or documents which may tend to show the corrupt election of a Senator when he was chosen or his misconduct since he was chosen, so that it may exercise in the one case its power to determine whether or not he was duly elected and in the other case its power to expel him if his conduct justifies such action, I submit that so far as the presidential and vice presidential electors are concerned and so far as the nomination of presidential candidates is concerned, Congress is absolutely without any power.

I am not unmindful that the present corrupt-practices act prohibits certain contributions in elections where presidential and vice presidential electors are chosen. I was on the Committee on Privileges and Elections when that bill was before it and when it was reported, and I protested against the amendment which brought presidential and vice presidential electors into it. The bill was introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] and when introduced contained no such provision. Without intending to impeach the motive of any man, because that is always a dangerous proceeding, for none of us can search the heart of a man and discern his motives, but disclaiming any intention to impeach the motive of any man, I have always believed that that amendment was forced into that bill in the hope of preventing its passage.

It is absolutely certain that when they forced that amendment into that bill they knew that they would force me to vote against it. I was compelled to vote against reporting it, and I would have voted against its passage but for the fact that it was called up in the Senate when I was occupied with other duties. Of course if the present law in that respect is valid, then this amendment, providing that this inquiry shall be extended to presidential and vice presidential candidates, would also be a lawful exercise of power. But just as I am absolutely certain that the present law, so far as it relates to presidential and vice presidential electors, is a nullity, so I am satisfied that this amendment, if adopted, would be a nullity.

I can understand the feeling of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. His name having been presented for that great office, some question having been raised as to the use of

money, though it was not with reference to his own candidacy, I can understand how he would want the whole matter fully and thoroughly examined and the result of that examination laid before the American people. But we are limited in our actions here by the Constitution of the United States, and we are not permitted, no matter how much we might be disposed to oblige one of our associates, no matter how much we might desire to know whether it is true or not that these enormous sums were expended, and although our desire for that knowledge might not be, and I am sure is not, a matter of mere idle or political curiosity, to force any man to testify with relation to those matters.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BAILEY. I will.

Mr. BACON. Conceding the soundness of the arguments presented by the Senator as to the relation the electors bear to the Federal Government, not endeavoring in any manner to minimize that, I want to suggest to the Senator that there is one contingency under which the election of President is not an election under officers of States.

Mr. BAILEY. No; that is in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BACON. Pardon me. The Senator has not permitted me to finish my question.

Mr. BAILEY. Excuse me. I thought I would answer it—

Mr. BACON. The fact is that there is a contingency in which the President may be elected by those who are not State officers. It is true that they are not in any technical term officers of the United States. Members of Congress are not; but still they are those who hold official station under the Federal Government. They are themselves a part of the Government. I presume the Senator will recognize that if this were an election in which the people at large chose a President, this legislation would not be subject to the criticisms which he is now making.

Mr. BAILEY. It would not be if the Constitution excluded that, but it would depend on the amendment of the Constitution submitting it to the people at large.

Mr. BACON. The Constitution now prescribes that if the majority of the electors shall fail to vote for one man for President and thereby secure his election, it shall go to the House of Representatives, and when it gets in the House of Representatives—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WORKS. At the request of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who has the joint resolution in charge and who is necessarily absent, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. BACON. The point I wish to present to the Senator is that when the election goes into the House of Representatives by reason of the failure of the electors to make a choice in the mode prescribed by the Constitution, the House of Representatives is perfectly free to choose any one of the three men whose names were presented as candidates. They are not restricted to any party. They are under no moral obligation, we may say, as the elector is, because the elector is now, under the unwritten law, the mouthpiece of the voters. When it comes to the election by the House of Representatives any Member of the House is perfectly free to determine for whom he shall vote, or according as he thinks this, that, or the other man may be the best of the three men. He is authorized to vote against a man if he does not believe he is a model man. He is authorized to vote against him if he does not believe he has pursued proper methods in securing the votes he did secure. Therefore, it seems to me that the argument presented by the Senator against this bill might be a conclusive one granting his premises, but there would be still one feature to be considered in this matter which does not come within the scope of his argument.

Mr. BAILEY. Allowing all the Senator says, it would be for the House of Representatives to determine with respect to the President and not for the Senate, because the Senate has no power to elect the President. If the Senator will examine what I said on Saturday, he will find that I was careful to say that Congress has no power over the election of a President, and to-day I have said the Senate has no power. I was not, of course, forgetful of the conditions under which the Senate might be required to choose a Vice President and the House required to choose a President, but the Senate would have no more right to inquire into the candidates for the Presidency than the House would have to inquire into the candidates for the Vice Presidency.

But I do not stickle even on that. I go to the proposition that until it has been ascertained that the regular and ordinary method of electing a President has failed, Congress has no jurisdiction over the subject. There is an ordinary method of electing a President and there is an extraordinary method of electing a President. In the pursuance of the ordinary method Congress has no power, because he is to be chosen by electors, and those electors are to be appointed as the Constitution prescribes.

Mr. President, I believe I will read the rather remarkable language of Oliver P. Morton in an argument which he made to this body upon the appointment of these electors, and it is quoted with approval by Chief Justice Fuller in the Michigan case. It goes as far as I did the other day.

The appointment of these electors is thus placed absolutely and wholly with the legislatures of the several States. They may be chosen by the legislature or the legislature may provide that they shall be elected by the people of the State at large or in districts, as are Members of Congress, which was the case formerly in many States; and it is, no doubt, competent for the legislature to authorize the governor or the supreme court of the State or any other agent of its will to appoint these electors.

I do not doubt that that is a correct statement of the law. The matter rests completely within the power of the State. Congress has no jurisdiction over it. Contemplating the remote possibility, and not so remote either in the present conjuncture, but contemplating a possibility that has occurred only once in the history of the Republic, the election of a Vice President by the Senate, we might inquire into the conduct of the candidates for the Vice Presidency by what I think would be a strained construction, but that is so remote a contingency that Democrats, at least, will hesitate before they predicate a power upon it.

The balance of this resolution, Mr. President, I would cordially support. I am not much inclined to engage in a mere excursion in the hope and expectation that something might be discovered, but when there is a challenge or a request by a Senator that allegations against him shall be investigated, I think the Senate ought promptly to respond to that challenge or request, and if there are charges against a Senator which he is reluctant to ask an investigation of, I think the Senate ought to be even more prompt in ordering an investigation.

As to the Senate itself, it can not make the investigation too all-embracing to suit me or to command my vote; and I confess to a very earnest desire to know where all this money was obtained with which these presidential aspirations were gratified or by which it was sought to gratify them. I should like to know how all of it was spent, but as a Senator in the Congress of the United States I have no power to inquire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to offer an amendment. On page 2, line 2, after the word "investigation," I move to insert "relating to campaign contributions and the conduct of political campaigns."

I do that for this reason: The resolution provides that "the Committee on Privileges and Elections or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized and directed to investigate fully into all statements and questions of fact referred to in the statement of personal privilege made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. PENROSE, on the floor of the Senate August 21, 1912, and all correspondence." I think that should read "correspondence relating to campaign contributions and the conduct of political campaigns." If thousands and tens of thousands of letters were asked for and the subcommittee got a mass of letters they could hardly find what they wanted. I believe it should be confined to political contributions and the conduct of political campaigns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah will be read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to call the attention of the author of the resolution to one part of it that, it seems to me, ought to be corrected in the interest of good English. It reads:

All correspondence and financial transactions between John D. Archbold and Members of Congress and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate is a part of the Congress of the United States, and Senators are Members of Congress, and there is no necessity—

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment has been made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand it has been changed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 2, after the word "investigation," insert "relating to political contributions and the conduct of political campaigns."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will not be adopted, for the reason that it would leave out of inquiry the entire subject matter to be inquired into under the resolution as it was originally introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania. The whole controversy in that entire matter and

the purpose on which the Senator from Pennsylvania rose to an expression of personal privilege was the very question as to whether it related to campaign expenses or whether it did not relate to campaign expenses. To limit the inquiry to merely campaign expenses would eliminate from the jurisdiction of the committee the subject matter which the Senator from Pennsylvania introduced.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to assure the Senator that I do not want to limit the investigation in any way. All I want to do is this—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate the object that I think the Senator from Utah has in view, and I agree with him entirely that irrelevant correspondence not involving any financial transaction ought not to be inquired into. However the resolution is worded, of course the committee is necessarily invested with some discretion and it would not inquire into it. I think it would be a good deal better if the Senator would withdraw his amendment and leave that matter in the discretion of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that would be all right if the resolution did not give a direction. It directs the Committee on Privileges and Elections to do this. The Senator must know that public men have tens of thousands, and perhaps some of them hundreds of thousands, of letters. I do not see, unless it is arranged in some way, how it could be obviated.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is limited in this way, perhaps: The Senator will remember an amendment, in line 14, page 1, of the resolution to transpose the language there so as to read "all financial transactions and correspondence relating thereto." That would limit it in the manner in which the Senator from Utah suggests.

Mr. SMOOT. I will accept that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah withdraws his amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I will withdraw the amendment and accept the amendment suggested by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Washington state his proposed amendment?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is to strike out the words in italics, in line 14, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof "and all financial transactions and all correspondence relating thereto."

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 14, strike out the words "including all correspondence and financial transactions" and insert "all financial transactions and correspondence relating thereto."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. A suggestion has just been made to me by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that as so many Senators have returned to their homes it is unlikely that there can be a meeting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections after the resolution is passed, if it should be passed, and that therefore the resolution could not in any formal way be referred by the chairman of the committee or by the committee to the subcommittee. The suggestion has been made that for that reason the resolution ought to be so modified as to refer it directly by the Senate to the subcommittee that has charge of this investigation. I recall that when the Senator from Pennsylvania first offered the resolution he offered it in that form, and some objection was made here to its being passed in that form, but in view of the situation I am not certain but that it ought to be so modified.

Mr. PENROSE. I looked carefully into that matter in offering the resolution and became convinced that it was not necessary, for this reason: The chairman can refer any matter to a subcommittee of the full committee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think that meets the criticism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to call the attention of the author of the resolution that as the resolution reads—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not understand that it had been agreed to. I thought the question was on agreeing to the resolution as amended. I think the language of the resolution on page 2, line 2, providing that they shall inquire "to the date of the investigation" is somewhat obscure. I was about to suggest that it read "to the date of the conclusion of the investigation."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is agreed to.

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it has been usual for many years, with the exception of last year, for the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations to prepare a comparative statement showing the total appropriations for the fiscal year, giving the appropriations of the year before, the estimates, and other information.

The present chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations has not arranged any prepared speech regarding the finances of the country, its incomes and expenditures, and he does not propose to make or undertake to make any political capital out of this statement, but to state the facts as he sees them. I want to say, and do so with great pleasure, that the President of the United States and his Cabinet have labored conscientiously to curtail expenditures to the lowest limit of safety. The estimates for this year were carefully prepared to be inside the estimated income by a safe margin.

The House of Representatives has, I must admit, endeavored to keep down the expenses of the Government—whether wisely or unwisely will be determined by the country; but I credit them with a desire to be economical and to keep expenses inside the estimates.

The total appropriations, regular, miscellaneous, and permanent, including every allowance of every nature for the year 1913, amount to \$1,019,636,143.66. The total appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 were \$1,026,682,881.72. The appropriations for 1913 are less than those for 1912 by \$7,046,738.06.

The appropriations for this fiscal year are less than the estimates by \$21,011,882.89. Of course supplemental estimates later made increased this difference. In order to keep that total of appropriations inside the limit of last year the House, in the first place, made a great many calculations for the coming year only, for the amount of money that will be exhausted between now and the 4th of March. Hence there will probably be, soon after we meet next winter, either a very large urgent deficiency appropriation bill or later a large general deficiency appropriation bill, or there will be in the regular appropriations permission for certain sums to be continued available.

The House, and rightly so, examined carefully the witnesses from the departments to know whether the money appropriated for last year and prior years had all been used or would be used before the end of the fiscal year 1912, thus to find out if there were margins which would go back into the Treasury. They discovered quite large surplus amounts, which goes to show, first, that preceding Congresses have endeavored to be liberal in appropriations, trusting to the capacity, honesty, and economy of the departments not to expend what might be to the credits of different accounts unless necessary, and to the everlasting credit of those who expend the money, there were found numerous and large surplus amounts.

These have all been taken into consideration and have caused smaller appropriations for the year 1913. That, of course, will not materially affect the future. There is also a short appropriation for the Panama Canal because it is nearing completion, and that will decrease still further.

As the Senate knows the canal was supposed to be built from money obtained from bonds, so that the present inhabitants of the United States should not be called upon to pay all the cost of it, but could allow those who may get the benefit of it years afterwards to have the privilege and duty of paying some portion of it. But we have only issued a comparatively small amount of bonds, and we have paid large sums each year, nearly \$50,000,000 last year and more than half as much this year. The discontinuance of that will help to make the bills in the future smaller.

I want to say, however, that I do not believe, with the growth of this country, that we have any right to expect the next administration, be it Republican, Democratic, or otherwise, to expend or to appropriate very much less, if any, than our expenses are now running, unless, indeed, we propose to cut into the future and lower the first year at the expense of the others to follow. I am prophesying that in the next four years run it will be found that the Government will expend annually a billion dollars, more or less—and I believe it will be more—at every session. These shortages, or what I think may be shortages, will of course be provided for, as usual, in deficiencies. I wish to say that in deficiencies the present Congress has been careful, and the preceding Congresses by their legislation have so far as possible wiped out the necessity of deficiencies.

The bills this year as they came from the House have, of course, been added to by the Senate, as has always been done heretofore. They sent the bills over here with that expectation. But we have added, with the single exception, perhaps, of the deficiency bill, only a small percentage, and we are clearly, with a wide margin, within our income; and in the future some provision, whether it may be made by customs

tariff or income tax or otherwise, will have to be made sufficient to cover these outgoes.

I send to the desk a prepared table—in fact, two tables—which I ask may go into the Record, with accompanying memoranda.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order is made.

Chronologica: history of appropriation bills, second session of the Sixty-second Congress; estimates and appropriations for the fiscal year 1912-13; and appropriations for the fiscal year 1911-12.

[Prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.]

The tables referred to are as follows:

Total appropriations, fiscal year 1912.....	\$1,026,682,881.72
Total appropriations, fiscal year 1913.....	1,019,636,143.66
Total estimates, fiscal year 1913.....	1,040,648,026.55
The appropriations for 1913 are less than the same for 1912.....	7,046,738.06
The appropriations for 1913 are less than the estimates.....	21,011,882.89

Titles.	Estimates, 1913.	Reported to the House.		Passed the House.	
		Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.
Agriculture.....	\$17,233,452.00	1912. Jan. 29	\$15,836,976.00	1912. Mar. 12	\$15,933,366.00
Army ¹	96,927,988.98	do. July 1	(88,854,257.18)	Feb. 16	(87,777,257.18)
Diplomatic and consular.....	4,079,697.41	Feb. 1	89,127,257.18	July 2	89,127,257.18
District of Columbia ²	12,954,720.50	Jan. 11	3,427,491.41	Mar. 28	3,418,791.41
Fortification.....	7,218,899.00	Feb. 14	10,302,208.00	Jan. 25	10,300,858.00
Indian.....	8,517,440.00	Feb. 23	4,036,235.00	Feb. 27	4,036,235.00
Legislative, etc. ¹	35,684,267.40	May 1	7,475,255.00	Apr. 9	7,516,255.00
Military Academy.....	1,894,928.63	Aug. 16	(33,519,594.06)	May 10	(33,782,854.06)
Navy.....	126,186,943.46	Aug. 21	(33,651,084.06)	Aug. 17	(33,651,084.06)
Pension.....	152,687,750.00	May 11	34,229,613.38	Aug. 21	34,229,613.38
Post office ⁴	260,938,463.00	May 21	1,033,860.26	May 31	1,034,260.26
River and harbor.....	\$ 17,345,450.00	May 15	118,809,337.76	May 28	118,551,437.76
Sundry civil.....	\$ 131,896,602.05	Jan. 29	152,579,000.00	Feb. 2	152,579,000.00
Total.....	873,566,602.43	Mar. 4	262,200,999.00	May 2	263,073,749.00
		Mar. 7	24,062,520.50	Mar. 19	24,062,520.50
		June 3	109,577,414.40	June 21	109,567,974.40
			832,698,167.89		833,431,317.89
Urgent deficiency, 1912, and prior years.....	19,200,000.00	1911. Dec. 15	2,364,756.46	1911. Dec. 16	2,364,756.46
Deficiency, 1912, and prior years.....		1912. July 25	6,182,838.24	1912. Aug. 8	6,185,238.24
Total.....	892,766,602.43		841,245,762.59		841,981,312.59
Miscellaneous.....	14,675,000.00				
Total, regular annual appropriations.....	907,441,602.43				
Permanent annual appropriations.....	133,206,424.12				
Grand total, regular and permanent annual appropriations.....	1,040,648,026.55				

Titles.	Reported to the Senate.		Passed the Senate.		Law, 1912-13.		Law, 1911-12.	
	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.	Date.	Amount.
Agriculture.....	1912. May 2	\$17,656,976.00	1912. May 16	\$18,111,976.00	1912. Aug. 10	\$16,651,496.00		
Army ¹	Apr. 2	(95,314,710.98)	Apr. 12	(95,343,510.98)	Veto Aug. 15	(90,654,562.98)		\$16,900,016.00
Diplomatic and consular.....	Aug. 2	95,392,630.98	Aug. 14	95,478,380.98	Aug. 24	90,483,403.16		93,374,755.97
District of Columbia ²	Apr. 4	3,788,347.11	Apr. 12	3,790,847.41	Apr. 30	3,638,047.41		3,988,516.41
Fortification.....	Mar. 2	12,668,014.50	Mar. 19	11,864,524.50	June 26	10,675,833.50		12,056,786.50
Indian.....	Mar. 12	4,186,235.00	Mar. 27	4,186,235.00	June 6	4,036,235.00		5,473,707.00
Legislative, etc. ¹	May 29	12,436,197.99	July 17	14,600,294.06	Aug. 24	9,854,184.46		8,842,136.37
Military Academy.....	June 1	(34,537,894.50)	June 14	(34,476,154.50)	Veto Aug. 15	(34,187,591.16)		
Navy.....	Aug. 19	(34,249,591.16)	Aug. 19	(34,187,591.16)	Aug. 21	(34,187,591.16)		35,378,149.85
Pension.....	Aug. 22	34,229,613.38	Aug. 22	34,229,613.38	Aug. 23	34,229,613.38		
Post office ⁴	June 11	1,064,668.26	July 24	1,064,668.26	Aug. 9	1,064,668.26		1,163,424.07
River and harbor.....	June 7	133,609,674.28	July 5	133,590,174.48	Aug. 22	123,220,707.48		126,478,338.24
Sundry civil.....	May 23	165,186,750.00	May 30	165,187,750.00	Aug. 17	165,146,145.84		153,682,000.00
Total.....	July 23	273,159,820.00	Aug. 14	273,642,309.00	Aug. 24	271,429,599.00		259,134,463.00
	May 4	31,853,530.50	May 9	31,883,530.50	July 25	31,059,370.50		72,855,342.00
	July 15	115,021,989.70	July 24	116,322,730.20	Aug. 24	112,039,184.40		142,265,044.14
		899,654,447.70		903,953,033.77		873,528,488.39		882,592,679.55
Urgent deficiency, 1912 and prior years.....	1911. Dec. 18	2,922,756.46	1911. Dec. 19	3,186,627.46	1911. Dec. 22	2,457,756.46		
Deficiency, 1912 and prior years.....	1912. Aug. 22	11,513,871.26	1912. Aug. 23	11,700,845.75	1912. Aug. 26	7,243,474.69		9,740,971.24
Total.....		914,091,075.42		918,840,506.98		883,229,719.54		892,333,650.79
Miscellaneous.....						13,200,000.00		4,773,306.81
Total regular and annual appropriations.....						886,429,719.54		897,106,957.60
Permanent annual appropriations.....						133,206,424.12		129,575,924.12
Grand total, regular and permanent annual appropriations.....						1,019,636,143.66		1,026,682,881.72

Amount of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1913.....

Amount of estimated postal revenues for fiscal year 1913.....

Total of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1913.....

¹ The Army and the legislative bills for 1913, as originally passed, were vetoed by the President June 17 and Aug. 15 and 21, 1912, respectively. In order to preserve their history, the several dates of their consideration are noted, and amounts carried are indicated in parentheses, but the amounts of the vetoed bills are not included in any of the totals stated herein.

² This amount includes \$1,350,000 appropriated in a joint resolution, approved July 8, 1912, for the Organized Militia, a like sum having been carried by the Army act which was vetoed, and omitted from the Army act finally approved.

³ One-half of the amounts for the District of Columbia payable by the United States, except amounts for the water department (estimated for 1913 at \$135,785), which are payable from the revenues of the water department.

⁴ Includes all expenses of the postal service payable from postal revenues and out of the Treasury.

⁵ In addition to this amount the sum of \$12,114,988, to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, is included in the sundry civil estimates for 1913.

⁶ In addition to this amount the sum of \$9,500,250, to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvement, is included in the sundry civil act for 1913.

⁷ In addition to this amount the sum of \$7,028,077 was appropriated in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1912.

⁸ This amount includes \$12,114,988 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$47,263,760.20 for construction and fortification of the Isthmian Canal for 1913.

⁹ This amount includes \$9,500,250 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$31,786,950 for construction of the Isthmian Canal for 1912.

¹⁰ This amount includes \$7,028,077 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$48,560,000 for the construction and fortification of the Isthmian Canal for 1912.

¹¹ This amount is approximated.

¹² This is the amount submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual estimates for the fiscal year 1913, the exact amount appropriated not being ascertainable until 2 years after the close of the fiscal year. This amount includes estimated amount of \$60,650,000 to meet sinking-fund obligations for 1913.

¹³ In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the fortification act \$371,400, by the naval act \$20,140,000, by the river and harbor act \$2,200,000; in all, \$221,711,400.

¹⁴ In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the naval act \$30,352,590, and by the river and harbor act \$13,101,645; in all, \$43,454,235.

Comparison of Appropriations, fiscal years 1912 and 1913.

Title of bill.	Fiscal year 1912.	Fiscal year 1913.	Increase 1913 over 1912.	Decrease 1913 under 1912.
Agriculture.....	\$16,900,016.00	\$16,651,496.00	\$248,520.00
Army.....	93,374,755.97	90,483,403.16	2,891,352.81
Diplomatic and consular.....	3,988,516.41	3,638,047.41	350,469.00
District of Columbia.....	12,056,786.50	10,675,833.50	1,380,953.00
Fortification.....	5,473,707.00	4,036,235.00	1,437,472.00
Indian.....	8,842,136.37	9,854,184.46	\$1,012,048.09
Legislative, etc.....	35,378,149.85	34,229,613.38	1,148,536.47
Military Academy.....	1,163,424.07	1,064,668.26	98,755.81
Navy.....	126,478,338.24	123,220,707.48	3,257,630.76
Pension.....	153,682,000.00	165,146,145.84	11,464,145.84
Post Office.....	259,134,463.00	271,429,599.00	12,295,136.00
River and harbor.....	23,855,342.00	31,059,370.50	7,204,028.50
Sundry civil.....	142,265,044.14	112,039,184.40	30,225,859.74
Total.....	882,592,679.55	873,528,488.39	31,975,358.43	41,039,549.59
Deficiencies.....	9,740,971.24	9,701,231.15	39,740.09
Miscellaneous.....	4,773,306.81	3,200,000.00	1,573,306.81
Total.....	897,106,957.60	886,429,719.54	1,613,046.90
Permanent annual appropriations.....	129,575,924.12	133,206,424.12	3,630,500.00
Grand total.....	1,026,682,881.72	1,019,636,143.66	35,605,858.43	42,652,596.49

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the net saving to the taxpayers of this country in all the appropriations this year is over \$7,000,000. I speak in round numbers. Not including the increase of pensions and rivers and harbors, the extraordinary increase in the post office, the net increase would be over \$37,000,000. So, in addition to providing for an increase in pensions, the increase of \$7,000,000 in rivers and harbors, and the various increases in the post-office appropriations—notwithstanding those great increases, we have saved more than \$7,000,000 to the taxpayers of this country. The saving was on the agricultural appropriation bill \$248,000 and on the Army appropriation \$2,891,000. We saved in the diplomatic and consular appropriations \$350,000 and on fortifications \$1,380,000. We saved on the legislative appropriations \$1,148,000, on the Military Academy \$98,000, on the Navy \$3,257,000, and on the sundry civil appropriation bill \$30,000,000, or a grand total of \$41,000,000 that we saved, the increases being in pensions and also in the post-office appropriations and the rivers and harbors.

Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator from Wyoming. I believe that with a proper economy in the Government we can save more than \$100,000,000 without injuring the efficiency of the Government.

I will ask to put in the RECORD a table showing a comparison of the appropriations of the fiscal years 1912 and 1913. It will show the decreases and also the increases.

The table referred to is as follows:

Comparison of appropriations, fiscal years 1912 and 1913.

Title of bill.	Fiscal year 1912.	Fiscal year 1913.	Increase 1913 over 1912.	Decrease 1913 under 1912.
Agriculture.....	\$16,900,016.00	\$16,651,496.00	\$248,520.00
Army.....	93,374,755.97	90,483,403.16	2,891,352.81
Diplomatic and consular.....	3,988,516.41	3,638,047.41	350,469.00
District of Columbia.....	12,056,786.50	10,675,833.50	1,380,953.00
Fortification.....	5,473,707.00	4,036,235.00	1,437,472.00
Indian.....	8,842,136.37	9,854,184.46	\$1,012,048.09
Legislative, etc.....	35,378,149.85	34,229,613.38	1,148,536.47
Military Academy.....	1,163,424.07	1,064,668.26	98,755.81
Navy.....	126,478,338.24	123,220,707.48	3,257,630.76
Pension.....	153,682,000.00	165,146,145.84	11,464,145.84
Post Office.....	259,134,463.00	271,429,599.00	12,295,136.00
River and harbor.....	23,855,342.00	31,059,370.50	7,204,028.50
Sundry civil.....	142,265,044.14	112,039,184.40	30,225,859.74
Total.....	882,592,679.55	873,528,488.39	31,975,358.43	41,039,549.59
Deficiencies.....	9,740,971.24	9,701,231.15	39,740.09
Miscellaneous.....	4,773,306.81	3,200,000.00	1,573,306.81
Total.....	897,106,957.60	886,429,719.54	1,613,046.90
Permanent annual appropriations.....	129,575,924.12	133,206,424.12	3,630,500.00
Grand total.....	1,026,682,881.72	1,019,636,143.66	35,605,858.43	42,652,596.49

Mr. OVERMAN. I also ask to put in the RECORD a table of appropriations by years from 1875 to 1912, showing in 1875 the total appropriations for the Government then were \$325,000,000, whereas in 1912 it was \$1,027,000,000. Even this appropriation, with this saving, is \$562,000,000 more than the appropriations made in 1896, when the Democrats were in full control of this Government. In other words, when Cleveland went out of office, and the year before his successor was sworn in, the ap-

propriations are now \$562,000,000 more as compared with that date.

I also ask leave to insert a table showing that the per capita cost of the United States Government in 1850 was \$2.60; in 1880 it was \$7.30; in 1900 it was \$10.78; in 1910 it was \$12.10; and this year under our appropriations it will be, so far as I can ascertain, less than \$11.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the tables presented by the Senator from North Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Total appropriation by years.			
1875.....	\$325,666,791.89	1895.....	\$459,925,178.62
1876.....	328,128,199.32	1896.....	457,088,344.72
1877.....	299,591,138.07	1897.....	469,494,010.41
1878.....	296,006,691.21	1898.....	485,002,044.72
1879.....	332,407,776.68	1899.....	862,682,487.06
1880.....	372,119,629.30	1900.....	690,667,188.54
1881.....	361,572,204.39	1901.....	719,278,826.89
1882.....	365,965,479.83	1902.....	757,607,464.72
1883.....	422,138,073.31	1903.....	796,633,864.79
1884.....	355,297,875.23	1904.....	736,578,402.76
1885.....	318,829,489.13	1905.....	732,197,855.84
1886.....	336,439,913.20	1906.....	765,553,620.06
1887.....	387,330,971.99	1907.....	871,041,847.40
1888.....	359,011,522.52	1908.....	918,362,324.07
1889.....	408,624,057.37	1909.....	1,008,397,543.56
1890.....	385,522,367.61	1910.....	1,044,401,857.12
1891.....	509,368,345.86	1911.....	1,027,901,629.18
1892.....	514,424,019.49	1912.....	1,026,682,881.72
1893.....	463,684,385.20		
1894.....	479,932,667.08	Total.....	22,451,668,979.87

Per capita cost of United States Government.

Year.	Expenses.	Population.	Per capita cost.
1850.....	\$60,407,019	23,191,876	\$2.60
1880.....	373,278,712	50,155,783	7.30
1900.....	819,318,953	75,994,575	10.78
1910.....	1,121,858,321	91,972,267	12.10

Mr. OVERMAN. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the total appropriations for the fiscal year 1912, and a table of appropriations for the fiscal year 1913.

The appropriations for 1913 are less than the appropriations for 1912 by \$7,046,738.06; and the appropriations for 1913 are less than the estimates by \$21,011,882.89.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the table referred to will be inserted in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Total appropriations, fiscal year 1912.....	\$1,026,682,881.72
Total appropriations, fiscal year 1913.....	1,019,636,143.66
Total estimates, fiscal year 1913.....	1,040,648,028.55
The appropriations for 1913 are less than the same for 1912.....	7,046,738.06
The appropriations for 1913 are less than the estimates.....	21,011,882.89

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I also ask leave to insert in the RECORD a comparative table, showing appropriations for the years 1896 and 1913, respectively. The year 1896 was the year the Democrats were in charge of this Government. I ask that these tables be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Comparison of appropriations, fiscal years 1896 and 1913.

Title of bill.	Fiscal year 1896.	Fiscal year 1913.	Increase 1913 over 1896.	Decrease 1913 under 1896.
Agriculture.....	\$3,303,750.00	\$16,651,496.00	\$13,347,746.00	
Army.....	23,252,608.09	90,483,403.16	67,230,795.07	
Diplomatic and consular.....	1,574,458.76	3,638,047.41	2,063,588.65	
District of Columbia.....	5,745,443.25	10,675,833.50	4,930,390.25	
Fortification.....	1,904,557.50	4,036,235.00	2,131,677.50	
Indian.....	8,762,751.24	9,854,184.46	1,091,433.22	
Legislative, etc.....	21,891,718.08	34,229,613.39	12,337,895.30	
Military Academy.....	464,261.66	1,064,668.26	600,406.60	
Navy.....	29,416,245.31	123,220,707.48	93,804,462.17	
Pension.....	141,381,570.00	165,146,145.84	23,764,575.84	
Post Office.....	89,545,997.88	271,429,599.00	181,883,601.12	
River and harbor.....		31,059,370.50	31,059,370.50	
Sundry civil.....	46,568,160.40	112,039,184.40	65,471,024.00	
Total.....	373,811,522.15	873,528,488.39	499,716,966.24	
Deficiencies.....	9,825,374.82	9,701,231.15		\$124,143.67
Miscellaneous.....	297,667.37	3,200,000.00	2,902,332.63	
Total.....	383,934,564.34	886,429,719.54		
Permanent annual Appropriations.....	73,153,780.38	133,206,424.12	60,052,643.74	
Grand total.....	457,088,344.72	1,019,636,143.66	562,547,798.94	124,143.67

Net increase of appropriations made for the fiscal year 1913 over the same for the fiscal year 1896, \$562,547,798.94.

Distance.	5 pounds, present rate.	5 pounds, parcel-post rate.	Reduction.	Per cent of reduction.
Rural route and city delivery.....	\$0.80	\$0.09	\$0.71	88
50-mile zone.....	.80	.17	.63	79
150-mile zone.....	.80	.22	.58	72
300-mile zone.....	.80	.27	.53	66
600-mile zone.....	.80	.32	.48	60
1,000-mile zone.....	.80	.37	.43	54
1,400-mile zone.....	.80	.46	.34	42
1,800-mile zone.....	.80	.51	.29	36
Over 1,800 miles.....	.80	.60	.20	25

The average haul of fourth-class matter is now 687 miles, with the flat rate favoring the long haul. Under the proposed zone rates the average haul will be much less than 600 miles. It is therefore apparent that the parcel-post law effects a reduction of 54 per cent under the present average distance and 60 per cent under the average distance under the new rates.

But the parcel-post rates do not suffer by comparison with express rates. In connection with the committee report upon the parcel-post provision I submitted some comparative tables, showing parcel-post rates for different distances and the express rates on shipments out of New York for similar distances. I took pains to explain that express rates out of New York are lower than in most sections of the country, but several who have reproduced those tables in part have failed to make this explanation and have in some instances shown only the rates on 11-pound parcels, in which case the comparison is, of course, most favorable to the express rates. In order to correct any erroneous impression that may have been given by such comparisons, I present a table showing rates from other points

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, during the recent discussion of the parcel-post provision of the Post Office appropriation bill a number of statements were made representing the parcel-post rates as unduly high when compared with existing express rates. I have no intention of occupying the time of the Senate with an extended discussion of this subject, but since a number of comparative tables of rates have been placed in the RECORD I deem it desirable to present for the same purpose some comparative figures I have prepared, based upon information secured from the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

First, however, I desire to demonstrate that even if it were true that the parcel-post rates are higher than express rates, yet they are so much lower than existing postage rates on fourth-class matter that the enactment of this law is fully justified by this reduction in charge for postal service. A comparison will show that the reduction is 25 per cent on the long-distance shipments, and that it varies for shorter distances, until we find a reduction of 88 per cent for the local and rural-route service. If nothing else were accomplished, this is a very considerable achievement in the interest of patrons of the postal service.

The following table shows the present postage charge on 5 pounds of fourth-class matter, the charge under the parcel-post law, the amount of reduction in cents and the per cent of the reduction by zones:

than New York, from which it will be seen that people in other sections of the country are paying considerably higher rates than the shippers from and to the American metropolis.

I would not be understood, Mr. President, as saying that any comparative table I present is absolutely accurate in showing relative rates. Owing to the complexity of the system of express charges, it is impossible to make an exact comparison with a parcel-post rate that applies the same between any two points the same distance apart and on all kinds of fourth-class matter. I believe, however, that by showing the lower rates and also some of the highest rates I am giving those who are interested a fair basis of comparison as it is possible to do.

Rates given in the following order:

First presents express rates from New York.

Second presents express rates from another city, similar distance.

Third presents express rates from third city, similar distance.

Fourth presents rates established by Bourne bill.

Miles.	Pounds.										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
50 miles from New York.....	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$0.25	\$0.30	\$0.30	\$0.35	\$0.35	\$0.35	\$0.35	\$0.35	\$0.35
San Francisco—Port Costa.....	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
Seattle—Bandra, Wash.....	.25	.30	.30	.35	.40	.40	.45	.45	.45	.45	.45
Bourne bill.....	.05	.08	.11	.14	.17	.20	.23	.26	.29	.32	.35
100 miles from New York.....	.25	.30	.30	.30	.35	.35	.35	.40	.40	.40	.40
Ashford, Wash.—Bismarck, Wash.....	.25	.30	.30	.35	.40	.40	.40	.45	.45	.45	.45
Espanola, N. Mex.—San Antonio, N. Mex.....	.25	.30	.35	.40	.45	.50	.50	.55	.55	.55	.55
Bourne bill.....	.06	.10	.14	.18	.22	.26	.30	.34	.38	.42	.46
200 miles from New York.....	.25	.30	.35	.35	.40	.45	.45	.50	.50	.50	.55
Atlanta, Ga.—Etowah, Tenn.....	.25	.30	.35	.35	.40	.45	.45	.50	.50	.50	.55
Los Angeles—Ludlow, Cal.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.65	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75	.90
Bourne bill.....	.07	.12	.17	.22	.27	.32	.37	.42	.47	.52	.57
300 miles from New York.....	.25	.30	.35	.40	.45	.50	.50	.55	.55	.55	.60
Minneapolis—Hope, S. Dak.....	.25	.30	.40	.45	.50	.55	.55	.60	.60	.60	.65
San Francisco—Truckee, Cal.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.80	.80	.90	.90	.90	1.00
Bourne bill.....	.07	.12	.17	.22	.27	.32	.37	.42	.47	.52	.57
400 miles from New York.....	.25	.30	.35	.40	.45	.50	.55	.55	.60	.60	.65
St. Louis—Parsons, Kans.....	.25	.35	.45	.55	.60	.70	.70	.75	.75	.75	.85
Espanola, N. Mex.—Placerville, Colo.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.35
Bourne bill.....	.08	.14	.20	.26	.32	.38	.44	.50	.56	.62	.68
500 miles from New York.....	.25	.30	.40	.45	.50	.55	.55	.60	.60	.60	.65
New Orleans—Clayton, Miss.....	.25	.30	.40	.45	.50	.55	.55	.60	.60	.60	.65
Ashford, Wash.—St. Voe, Idaho.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.15
Bourne bill.....	.08	.14	.20	.26	.32	.38	.44	.50	.56	.62	.68

Miles.	Pounds.										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
600 miles from New York.....	\$0.25	\$0.35	\$0.45	\$0.50	\$0.55	\$0.60	\$0.60	\$0.70	\$0.70	\$0.70	\$0.75
Chicago—Topeka.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.65	.75	.75	.80	.80	.80	.90
San Francisco—Palsade, Nev.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.10	1.10	1.25	1.25
Bourne bill.....	.08	.14	.20	.26	.32	.38	.44	.50	.56	.62	.68
700 miles from New York.....	.25	.35	.45	.55	.60	.70	.70	.75	.75	.75	.85
Baldwin, Wis.—Tamaroa, Ill.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.65	.75	.75	.80	.80	.80	.90
San Francisco—Halsey, Oreg.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.85	.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10
Bourne bill.....	.09	.16	.23	.30	.37	.44	.51	.58	.65	.72	.79
800 miles from New York.....	.25	.35	.45	.55	.60	.70	.70	.75	.75	.75	.85
Chamblee, Ga.—Grassland, N. C.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.85	.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10
San Francisco—Portland, Oreg.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.85	.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10
Bourne bill.....	.09	.16	.23	.30	.37	.44	.51	.58	.65	.72	.79
900 miles from New York.....	.25	.35	.45	.55	.60	.70	.70	.75	.75	.75	.85
Waynesboro, Va.—Athens, Ala.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.15
Fairfield, Conn.—Frankfort, Ky.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.80	.80	.90	.90	.90	1.00
Bourne bill.....	.09	.16	.23	.30	.37	.44	.51	.58	.65	.72	.79
1,000 miles from New York.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.80	.80	.90	.90	.90	1.00
Marthasville, Mo.—Katy, Ky.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.80	.80	.90	.90	.90	1.00
Waynesboro, Va.—Helena, Ark.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.15
Bourne bill.....	.09	.16	.23	.30	.37	.44	.51	.58	.65	.72	.79
1,100 miles from New York.....	.25	.35	.45	.60	.70	.85	.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10
National City, Cal.—Bernalillo, N. Mex.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.50
Bourne bill.....	.10	.19	.28	.37	.46	.55	.64	.73	.82	.91	1.00
1,200 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.15
Minneapolis—Coram, Mont.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.35
Baldwin, Wis.—Crystal Springs, Miss.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.25
Bourne bill.....	.10	.19	.28	.37	.46	.55	.64	.73	.82	.91	1.00
1,300 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.15
Fairfield, Conn.—Athens, Ala.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	.90	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.25
Minneapolis—McComb, Miss.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.35
Bourne bill.....	.10	.19	.28	.37	.46	.55	.64	.73	.82	.91	1.00
1,400 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.15
Minneapolis—New Orleans.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.35
Minneapolis—Bonners Ferry, Mont.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.25	1.25	1.50
Bourne bill.....	.11	.21	.31	.41	.51	.61	.71	.81	.91	1.01	1.11
1,500 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.35
Minneapolis—Camden, Wash.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.25	1.25	1.50
Fairfield, Conn.—Garland, Ala.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.75	.90	1.00	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.35
Bourne bill.....	.11	.21	.31	.41	.51	.61	.71	.81	.91	1.01	1.11
1,600 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.50
San Francisco—Pueblo, Colo.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.50
Minneapolis—Wilson Creek, Wash.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.35	1.35	1.60
Bourne bill.....	.11	.21	.31	.41	.51	.61	.71	.81	.91	1.01	1.11
1,700 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.50
Denver—San Francisco.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.35	1.35	1.60
Bourne bill.....	.11	.21	.31	.41	.51	.61	.71	.81	.91	1.01	1.11
1,800 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.25	1.25	1.50
Minneapolis—Seattle.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.35	1.40	1.60
Bourne bill.....	.12	.24	.36	.48	.60	.72	.84	.96	1.08	1.20	1.32
2,500 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.35	1.40	1.60
Los Angeles—Buffalo, 2,774 miles.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.05	1.20	1.35	1.50	1.65
Los Angeles—Chicago.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.00	1.20	1.35	1.40	1.60
Bourne bill.....	.12	.24	.36	.48	.60	.72	.84	.96	1.08	1.20	1.32
3,000 miles from New York.....	.30	.35	.45	.60	.80	.90	1.05	1.20	1.35	1.50	1.65
Ashford, Wash.—Campbellville, N. Y., 3,008 miles.....	.35	.40	.50	.65	.85	1.00	1.15	1.30	1.50	1.65	1.80
Bourne bill.....	.12	.24	.36	.48	.60	.72	.84	.96	1.08	1.20	1.32

As already indicated, I believe it unfair to compare charges on only the largest packages and ignore the low rates of the parcel post on the small packages. The rates on all sizes of packages should be taken into consideration, for the ordinary patron of the express or parcel-post service sends more small packages than large ones. In fact, experience in foreign countries shows that under an 11-pound weight limit the average size of the parcel is between 3 and 4 pounds. In an effort to show a comparison of rates on all sizes of packages for all distances I present a table showing the parcel-post and the express charges on 11 packages weighing from 1 to 11 pounds—the total weight of the 11 packages being 66 pounds—and also the charges on

these 11 packages for each of the zone distances. I then make a total of all charges on all packages for all distances by each method of transportation, showing the difference in the total charges and the per cent of the difference. In this comparison I am using the express rates from New York as taken from the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In this connection, however, it must be remembered that the parcel-post service includes a delivery on a rural route, which the express service does not, so that even if the rates were the same the comparison would result favorably to the parcel-post service. I do not claim that this comparison is absolutely exact, but it is as fair as I know how to make it.

Pounds.	50-mile zone.		150-mile zone.		300-mile zone.		600-mile zone.		1,000-mile zone.		1,400-mile zone.		1,800-mile zone.		Over 1,800-mile zone.	
	Parcel post.	Express rate.	Parcel post.	Express rate.	Parcel post.	Express rate.	Parcel post.	Express rate.	Parcel post.	Express rate.	Parcel post.	Express rate.	Parcel post.	Express rate.	Parcel post.	Express rate.
1.....	\$0.05	\$0.25	\$0.06	\$0.25	\$0.07	\$0.25	\$0.08	\$0.25	\$0.09	\$0.25	\$0.10	\$0.30	\$0.11	\$0.30	\$0.12	\$0.30
2.....	.08	.25	.10	.30	.12	.30	.14	.30	.16	.35	.19	.35	.21	.35	.24	.35
3.....	.11	.25	.14	.30	.17	.35	.20	.40	.23	.45	.28	.45	.31	.45	.36	.45
4.....	.14	.25	.18	.30	.22	.40	.26	.45	.30	.55	.37	.60	.41	.60	.48	.60
5.....	.17	.25	.22	.35	.27	.45	.32	.50	.37	.60	.46	.75	.51	.75	.60	.80
6.....	.20	.30	.26	.35	.32	.50	.38	.55	.44	.70	.55	.90	.61	.90	.72	.90
7.....	.23	.30	.30	.35	.37	.50	.44	.55	.51	.70	.64	.90	.71	1.00	.84	1.00
8.....	.26	.30	.34	.40	.42	.55	.50	.60	.58	.75	.73	1.00	.81	1.15	.96	1.20
9.....	.29	.30	.38	.40	.47	.55	.56	.60	.65	.75	.82	1.00	.91	1.15	1.08	1.35
10.....	.32	.30	.42	.40	.52	.55	.62	.60	.72	.75	.91	1.00	1.01	1.15	1.20	1.40
11.....	.35	.30	.46	.40	.57	.60	.68	.65	.79	.85	1.00	1.15	1.11	1.35	1.32	1.60
66.....	2.20	3.05	2.76	3.80	3.52	5.00	4.18	5.45	4.84	6.70	6.05	8.40	6.71	9.15	7.92	9.95

Comparison of aggregates.

	Parcel post.	Express rate.
50-mile zone.....	\$2.20	\$3.05
150-mile zone.....	2.76	3.80
300-mile zone.....	3.52	5.00
600-mile zone.....	4.18	5.45
1,000-mile zone.....	4.84	6.70
1,400-mile zone.....	6.05	8.40
1,800-mile zone.....	6.71	9.15
Over 1,800-mile zone.....	7.92	9.95
	38.18	51.50
Parcel-post rates—Reduction from present express charges..... per cent.. 25.67		

ADVANCE IN PRICE OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. SMOOT. I present a statement showing the exchange value of farm products from the year 1896 to 1911, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the statement presented by him. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

THE ADVANCE IN THE PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS DURING THE PERIOD FROM 1896 TO 1911.

With advancing prices the products of the farm show a much greater advance than do the commodities which the farmer purchases for consumption or for use on the farm.

The average prices of the principal farm products of the East, the South, the Middle West, and the Far West in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, show a remarkable change in conditions during that period. All prices used in the following tables are taken from Bulletin No. 39 and Bulletin No. 99 of the United States Bureau of Labor.

The table which follows shows the average price in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, and also the advance during the period between those dates for all articles except wheat, for which September prices are compared for the reason that, according to the reports of the United States Department of Agriculture, more wheat is marketed by the farmers during September than during any other one month of the year.

Average price in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, and the advance since December, 1896.

Article.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Advance since December, 1896.	
			Actual advance.	Per cent advance.
Corn, per bushel.....	\$0.69	\$0.23	\$0.46	200
Wheat, per bushel.....	11.00	1.60	9.40	157
Cotton, per pound.....	.0936	.0730	.0206	28
Oats, per bushel.....	.46½	.17½	.29	166
Rye, per bushel.....	.92½	.39	.53½	137
Barley, per bushel.....	1.22½	.30	.92½	308
Hay, timothy, per ton.....	20.56	8.65	11.91	138
Hops, per pound.....	.56	.14½	.41½	286
Potatoes, per bushel.....	.84	.22	.62	282
Flaxseed, per bushel.....	1.94	.78	1.16	149
Cattle, choice extra steers, per 100 pounds.....	8.26	5.10	3.16	62
Hogs, heavy, per 100 pounds.....	6.21	3.22	2.99	96
Butter, dairy, per pound.....	.34½	.18½	.16	86
Eggs, fresh, per dozen.....	.47	.24½	.22½	90

¹ September.

The prices of the principal farm products above enumerated show phenomenal increases between the dates named, as follows:

	Per cent.
Corn advanced.....	200
Wheat advanced.....	67
Cotton advanced.....	28
Oats advanced.....	166
Rye advanced.....	137
Barley advanced.....	308
Hay advanced.....	138
Hops advanced.....	286
Potatoes advanced.....	282
Flaxseed advanced.....	149
Fat cattle advanced.....	62
Fat hogs advanced.....	96
Dairy butter advanced.....	86
Eggs advanced.....	90

EXCHANGE VALUES OF FARM PRODUCTS.

The exchange value of any article represents its real value, and the real worth of any article produced on the farm is measured by its value in exchange for articles which the farmer desires to purchase. No compilation of retail prices for 1911 and 1896 are available, but the retail price of any commodity follows, in a general way, the wholesale price. Without retail prices it is impossible to measure the exact purchasing power of farm products, but the proportionate change in purchasing power is practically the same when wholesale prices are used as when retail prices are used.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 46 pounds of Rio coffee in December, 1911, and 23 pounds in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 16 gallons of New Orleans molasses in December, 1911, and 7 gallons in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 7 barrels of salt in December, 1911, and 4 barrels in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 123 pounds of granulated sugar in December, 1911, and 56 pounds in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 110 yards of Amoskeag gingham in December, 1911, and 34 yards in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 85 yards of Fruit of the Loom shirts in December, 1911, and 34 yards in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 74 gallons of refined petroleum in December, 1911, and 23 gallons in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 350 pounds of galvanized barbed wire in December, 1911, and 117 pounds in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 433 pounds of 8-penny wire nails in December, 1911, and 170 pounds in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 1,066 common brick in December, 1911, and 460 in December, 1896.

Ten bushels of corn equaled in value 5 barrels of Portland cement in December, 1911, and 1.2 barrels in December, 1896.

The tables which follow show the value in 1911 and at a corresponding date in 1896 of corn, wheat, cotton, oats, rye, barley, hay, hops, potatoes, flaxseed, fat cattle, fat hogs, dairy butter, and fresh eggs.

Value of 10 bushels of corn in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	46	23	23
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons...	16	7	9
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds...	140	42	98
Salt, American.....	Barrels...	7	4	3
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds...	123	56	67
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	28	8	20
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards...	5	2	3
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	13	5	8
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	69	35	34
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	110	48	62
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	31	13	18
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	110	41	69
Shirts, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	85	34	51
Shoes, men's, vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs...	12	1	11
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards...	6	3	3
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels...	39	15	24
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	64	23	41
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons...	74	23	51
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds...	350	117	233
Nails, wire, eightpenny.....	do.....	433	170	263
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks...	1,066	460	606
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels...	5	1½	3½
Lime, common.....	do.....	6	4	2
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet...	127	63	64
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.	1½	½	1
Spruce.....	Feet...	271	161	110

¹ With \$1.63 remaining. ² With \$0.05 remaining. ³ With \$1.58 remaining.

Value of 10 bushels of wheat in September, 1911, and in September, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

[According to the reports of the Department of Agriculture more wheat is marketed by the farmers in September than in any other month of the year.]

Article.	Unit.	September, 1911.	September, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	74	56	18
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons...	25	18	7
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds...	211	116	95
Salt, American.....	Barrels...	11½	10½	1
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds...	152	133	19
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	40	22	18
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards...	8	6	2
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	18	14	4
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	100	91	9
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	143	140	3
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	41	34	7

Article.	Unit.	September, 1911.	September, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.	Yards	148	108	40
Shirtings, bleached, Fruit of the Loom.	do.	123	93	30
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.	Pairs	13	2	11
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.	Yards	9	8	1
Coal, anthracite, stove.	Bushels	57	41	16
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).	do.	93	61	32
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.	Gallons	108	59	49
Barb wire, galvanized.	Pounds	459	321	138
Nails, wire, eightpenny.	do.	572	189	383
Brick, common, domestic.	Bricks	1,637	1,323	314
Cement, Portland, domestic.	Barrels	64	3	34
Lime, common.	do.	8	9	1
Oak, white, plain.	Feet	182	164	18
Shingles, cypress.	Thousand.	2	2 ¹ / ₂	1 ¹ / ₂
Spruce.	Feet.	417 ¹ / ₂	417	0

¹ With \$2.07 remaining.² With \$1.45 remaining.³ With \$0.62 remaining.⁴ Less in 1911 than in 1896.

Value of 1 bale (500 pounds) of cotton in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.	Pounds	313	365	152
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.	Gallons	110	121	11
Rice, domestic, choice.	Pounds	947	678	269
Salt, American.	Barrels	53	66	13
Sugar, granulated.	Pounds	834	890	156
Tea, Formosa, fine.	do.	191	128	63
Carpet, Brussels.	Yards	39	38	1
Carpet, ingrain.	do.	88	89	1
Cotton flannel, 2 ¹ / ₂ yards to the pound.	do.	468	561	193
Gingham, Amoskeag.	do.	749	798	119
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.	do.	212	208	4
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.	do.	749	663	86
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.	do.	575	550	25
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.	Pairs	17	16	1
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.	Yards	43	51	18
Coal, anthracite, stove.	Bushels	265	250	15
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).	do.	437	378	59
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.	Gallons	506	365	141
Barb wire, galvanized.	Pounds	2,354	1,871	483
Nails, wire, eightpenny.	do.	2,925	2,703	222
Brick, common, domestic.	Bricks	7,202	7,300	198
Cement, Portland, domestic.	Barrels	35	18	17
Lime, common.	do.	43	60	17
Oak, white, plain.	Feet	859	1,006	1147
Shingles, cypress.	Thousand.	13	14.6	1.6
Spruce.	Feet.	1,835	2,561	1726

¹ Less in 1911 than in 1896.

Value of 20 bushels of oats in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.	Pounds	62	35	27
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.	Gallons	21	11	10
Rice, domestic, choice.	Pounds	188	65	123
Salt, American.	Barrels	10	6	4
Sugar, granulated.	Pounds	165	85	80
Tea, Formosa, fine.	do.	38	12	26
Carpet, Brussels.	Yards	7	3	4
Carpet, ingrain.	do.	17	8	9
Cotton flannel, 2 ¹ / ₂ yards to the pound.	do.	93	54	39
Gingham, Amoskeag.	do.	148	73	75
Sheetings, bleached, 4/4, Pepperell.	do.	42	20	22
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.	do.	148	63	85
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.	do.	114	52	62
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.	Pairs	13	11	2
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.	Yards	8	5	3
Coal, anthracite, stove.	Bushels	52	24	28
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).	do.	86	36	50
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.	Gallons	100	35	65
Barb wire, galvanized.	Pounds	470	180	290
Nails, wire, eightpenny.	do.	582	260	322
Brick, common, domestic.	Bricks	1,432	702	730
Cement, Portland, domestic.	Barrels	7	1 ¹ / ₂	5 ¹ / ₂
Lime, common.	do.	8	5	3
Oak, white, plain.	Feet	170	96	74
Shingles, cypress.	Thousand.	2 ¹ / ₂	1 ¹ / ₂	1 ¹ / ₂
Spruce.	Feet.	365	246	119

¹ With \$1.36 remaining.² With \$1.26 remaining.³ With \$0.10 remaining.

Value of 20 bushels of rye in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.	Pounds	124	78	46
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.	Gallons	43	26	17
Rice, domestic, choice.	Pounds	375	145	230
Salt, American.	Barrels	21	14	7
Sugar, granulated.	Pounds	330	190	140
Tea, Formosa, fine.	do.	75	27	48
Carpet, Brussels.	Yards	15	8	7
Carpet, ingrain.	do.	35	19	16
Cotton flannel, 2 ¹ / ₂ yards to the pound.	do.	185	120	65
Gingham, Amoskeag.	do.	296	164	132
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.	do.	84	44	40
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.	do.	296	142	154
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.	do.	227	117	110
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.	Pairs	16	13	3
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.	Yards	17	11	6
Coal, anthracite, stove.	Bushels	104	53	51
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).	do.	172	81	91
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.	Gallons	200	78	122
Barb wire, galvanized.	Pounds	935	400	535
Nails, wire, eightpenny.	do.	1,157	578	579
Brick, common, domestic.	Bricks	2,850	1,562	1,288
Cement, Portland, domestic.	Barrels	14	3 ¹ / ₂	10 ¹ / ₂
Lime, common.	do.	17	13	4
Oak, white, plain.	Feet	339	215	124
Shingles, cypress.	Thousand.	5 ¹ / ₂	3 ¹ / ₂	2
Spruce.	Feet.	726	545	178

¹ With \$2.62 remaining.² With \$1.06 remaining.³ With \$1.56 remaining.

Value of 20 bushels of barley in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.	Pounds	163	59	104
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.	Gallons	57	19	38
Rice, domestic, choice.	Pounds	495	111	384
Salt, American.	Barrels	28	10	18
Sugar, granulated.	Pounds	436	146	290
Tea, Formosa, fine.	do.	100	21	79
Carpet, Brussels.	Yards	20	6	14
Carpet, ingrain.	do.	46	14	32
Cotton flannel, 2 ¹ / ₂ yards to the pound.	do.	245	92	153
Gingham, Amoskeag.	do.	392	126	266
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.	do.	111	34	77
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.	do.	392	108	284
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.	do.	301	90	211
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.	Pairs	19	22	3
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.	Yards	22	8	14
Coal, anthracite, stove.	Bushels	138	41	97
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).	do.	228	62	166
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.	Gallons	264	59	205
Barb wire, galvanized.	Pounds	1,237	307	930
Nails, wire, eightpenny.	do.	1,531	443	1,088
Brick, common, domestic.	Bricks	3,769	1,198	2,571
Cement, Portland, domestic.	Barrels	18	3	15
Lime, common.	do.	22	10	12
Oak, white, plain.	Feet	449	165	284 ¹ / ₂
Shingles, cypress.	Thousand.	6 ¹ / ₂	2 ¹ / ₂	4
Spruce.	Feet.	960	420	540

¹ With \$0.65 remaining.² With \$1.49 remaining.³ With \$1.81 remaining.

Value of 1 ton of timothy hay in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.	Pounds	137	86	51
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.	Gallons	48	28	20
Rice, domestic, choice.	Pounds	416	160	256
Salt, American.	Barrels	23	15	8
Sugar, granulated.	Pounds	366	211	155
Tea, Formosa, fine.	do.	83	30	53
Carpet, Brussels.	Yards	17	9	8
Carpet, ingrain.	do.	38	21	17
Cotton flannel, 2 ¹ / ₂ yards to the pound.	do.	205	133	72
Gingham, Amoskeag.	do.	228	182	146
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.	do.	93	49	44
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.	do.	328	157	171
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.	do.	252	130	122
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.	Pairs	17	13	4
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.	Yards	19	12	7
Coal, anthracite, stove.	Bushels	116	59	57
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).	do.	191	89	102
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.	Gallons	222	86	136
Barb wire, galvanized.	Pounds	1,038	443	595

¹ With \$2.01 remaining.² With \$1.90 remaining.³ With \$0.11 remaining.

Article.	Unit.	Decem-ber, 1911.	Decem-ber, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Nails, wire, eightpenny.....	Pounds...	1,285	640	645
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	3,163	1,730	1,433
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	15	4 ³ / ₈	10 ⁷ / ₈
Lime, common.....	do.....	18	14	4
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	377	238	139
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	5 ⁷ / ₈	3 ³ / ₈	2 ³ / ₈
Spruce.....	Feet.....	806	607	199

Value of 100 pounds of hops in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	Decem-ber, 1911.	Decem-ber, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	374	145	229
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons.....	131	48	83
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds.....	1,133	269	864
Salt, American.....	Barrels.....	64	26	38
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds.....	998	353	645
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	228	50	172
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards.....	46	15	31
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	106	35	71
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	560	223	337
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	896	305	591
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	254	82	172
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	896	263	633
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	688	218	470
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs.....	121	14	107
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards.....	52	20	32
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels.....	317	99	218
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	522	150	372
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons.....	605	145	460
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds.....	2,828	743	2,085
Nails, wire, eight penny.....	do.....	3,500	1,074	2,426
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	8,615	2,900	5,715
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	42	7	35
Lime, common.....	do.....	51	24	27
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	1,027	400	627
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	15 ¹ / ₂	5 ⁵ / ₈	9 ⁷ / ₈
Spruce.....	Feet.....	2,196	1,017	1,179

¹ With \$0.35 remaining. ² With \$1 remaining. ³ With \$2 remaining.

Value of 20 bushels of potatoes in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	Decem-ber, 1911.	Decem-ber, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	112	44	68
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons.....	39	14	25
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds.....	340	82	258
Salt, American.....	Barrels.....	19	8	11
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds.....	299	108	191
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	68	15	53
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards.....	14	4	10
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	31	10	21
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	168	68	100
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	269	93	176
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	76	25	51
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	269	80	189
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	206	66	140
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs.....	16	1	15
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards.....	15	6	9
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels.....	95	30	65
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	157	45	112
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons.....	181	44	137
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds.....	849	227	622
Nails, wire, eight penny.....	do.....	1,051	320	731
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	2,587	886	1,701
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	12	2 ³ / ₈	9 ⁵ / ₈
Lime, common.....	do.....	15	7	8
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	308	122	186
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	4 ⁴ / ₈	1 ¹ / ₈	2 ³ / ₈
Spruce.....	Feet.....	659	310	349

¹ With \$0.92 remaining. ² With \$2.18 remaining. ³ With \$1.39 remaining.

Value of 10 bushels of flaxseed in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	Decem-ber, 1911.	Decem-ber, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	129	78	51
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons.....	45	25	19
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds.....	392	144	248
Salt, American.....	Barrels.....	22	14	8

Article.	Unit.	Decem-ber, 1911.	Decem-ber, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds...	345	190	155
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	79	27	52
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards.....	16	8	8
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	36	19	17
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	194	129	74
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	310	164	146
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	88	44	44
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	310	141	169
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	238	117	121
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs.....	17	3	14
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards.....	18	11	7
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels.....	109	53	56
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	181	80	101
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons.....	209	78	131
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds.....	979	400	579
Nails, wire, eightpenny.....	do.....	1,212	577	635
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	2,984	1,560	1,424
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	14	3 ³ / ₈	10 ⁷ / ₈
Lime, common.....	do.....	17	13	4
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	355	215	140
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	5 ¹ / ₂	3 ³ / ₈	2 ³ / ₈
Spruce.....	Feet.....	760	547	213

¹ With \$0.85 remaining. ² With \$1.05 remaining. ³ With \$2.45 remaining.

Value of a 1,200-pound choice to extra steer in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	Decem-ber, 1911.	Decem-ber, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	663	612	51
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons.....	233	204	29
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds.....	2,007	1,137	870
Salt, American.....	Barrels.....	113	111	2
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds.....	1,767	1,489	278
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	404	214	190
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards.....	82	65	17
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	187	150	37
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	992	941	51
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	1,586	1,288	298
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	450	349	101
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	1,586	1,112	474
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	1,219	923	296
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs.....	37	27	10
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards.....	92	86	6
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels.....	561	419	142
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	925	634	291
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons.....	1,071	612	459
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds.....	5,007	3,138	1,869
Nails, wire, eight penny.....	do.....	6,196	4,533	1,663
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	15,253	12,240	3,013
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	75	80	45
Lime, common.....	do.....	91	102	11
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	1,819	1,688	131
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	27	24	3
Spruce.....	Feet.....	3,888	4,294	1,406

¹ Less in 1911 than in 1896.

Value of a 300-pound hog in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	Decem-ber, 1911.	Decem-ber, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	126	96	30
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons.....	44	32	12
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds.....	383	179	204
Salt, American.....	Barrels.....	21	17	4
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds.....	337	235	102
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	77	33	44
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards.....	15	10	5
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	35	23	12
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	189	148	41
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	302	203	99
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	86	55	31
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	302	175	127
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	232	145	87
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs.....	17	4	13
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards.....	17	13	4
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels.....	107	66	41
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	175	100	75
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons.....	204	96	108
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds.....	956	494	462
Nails, wire, eight penny.....	do.....	1,183	714	469
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	2,912	1,930	982
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	14	4 ³ / ₈	9 ⁵ / ₈
Lime, common.....	do.....	17	16	1
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	347	266	81
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	5 ¹ / ₂	3 ³ / ₈	1 ⁷ / ₈
Spruce.....	Feet.....	742	677	65

¹ With \$0.38 remaining. ² With \$0.65 remaining. ³ With \$2.38 remaining.

Value of 20 pounds of dairy butter in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	46	37	9
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons...	16	12	4
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds...	140	69	71
Salt, American.....	Barrels...	7	6	1
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds...	123	90	33
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	Pounds...	28	13	15
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards...	5	4	1
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	13	9	4
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	69	57	12
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	110	78	32
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	31	21	10
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	110	67	43
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	85	56	29
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs.....	12	11	1
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards.....	6	5	1
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels.....	39	25	14
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	64	38	26
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons.....	74	37	37
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds.....	350	190	160
Nails, wire, eightpenny.....	do.....	433	275	158
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	1,066	744	322
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	5	1½	3½
Lime, common.....	do.....	6	6	0
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	127	102	25
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	1½	1½	0
Spruce.....	Feet.....	271	261	10

¹ With \$1.63 remaining. ² With \$1.47 remaining. ³ With \$0.16 remaining.

Value of one case (30 dozen) of fresh eggs in December, 1911, and in December, 1896, when measured by the wholesale prices of the following staple articles:

Article.	Unit.	December, 1911.	December, 1896.	Excess, 1911 over 1896.
Coffee, Rio, No. 7.....	Pounds...	94	74	20
Molasses, New Orleans, open kettle.....	Gallons...	33	24	9
Rice, domestic, choice.....	Pounds...	285	137	148
Salt, American.....	Barrels...	16	13	3
Sugar, granulated.....	Pounds...	251	180	71
Tea, Formosa, fine.....	do.....	57	26	31
Carpet, Brussels.....	Yards...	11	8	3
Carpet, ingrain.....	do.....	26	18	8
Cotton flannel, 2½ yards to the pound.....	do.....	141	114	27
Gingham, Amoskeag.....	do.....	225	156	69
Sheetings, bleached, 10/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	64	42	22
Sheetings, brown, 4/4, Pepperell.....	do.....	225	134	91
Shirtings, bleached, 4/4, Fruit of the Loom.....	do.....	173	111	62
Shoes, men's vici kid, Goodyear welt.....	Pairs.....	15	13	2
Suitings, clay worsted diagonal, 12-ounce.....	Yards.....	13	10	3
Coal, anthracite, stove.....	Bushels.....	79	50	29
Coal, bituminous, Georges Creek (New York Harbor).....	do.....	131	76	55
Petroleum, refined, 150° water white.....	Gallons.....	152	74	78
Barb wire, galvanized.....	Pounds.....	712	380	332
Nails, wire, eightpenny.....	do.....	881	548	333
Brick, common, domestic.....	Bricks.....	2,169	1,482	687
Cement, Portland, domestic.....	Barrels.....	10	3½	6½
Lime, common.....	do.....	12	12	0
Oak, white, plain.....	Feet.....	258	204	54
Shingles, cypress.....	Thousand.....	3½	2½	1
Spruce.....	Feet.....	552	520	32

¹ With \$0.85 remaining. ² With \$0.66 remaining. ³ With \$0.19 remaining.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WARREN. I now ask that the Senate take up the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 25970) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to say, so as to have it before the Senate in proper form, that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who had pending one or two motions to which several amendments had been offered by others, has asked me to consider his motion as withdrawn. I therefore now make the motion that the Senate recede from its amendments to the deficiency bill now in disagreement between the two Houses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] will be considered as withdrawn. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] now

moves that the Senate recede from its amendments now in disagreement between the two Houses.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am going to occupy the time of the Senate but a very few moments. Because of the position which I took the other morning in opposition to the conference report on the general deficiency appropriation bill, I feel it my duty to make a statement to the Senate that I propose to withdraw my opposition to its present consideration.

I feel, I realize, and I know, Mr. President, that any one Member of the Senate, or possibly any one Member of the House, might defeat the consideration of this bill. I have been induced by the solicitation of my friends here, who are also friends of the bill, to withdraw my opposition to it at this time; and I am induced to do so not only by those considerations, but by considerations of public policy as well.

In the first place, I know that there are many appropriations to pay for claims in that bill to go to men who are absolutely in need, and it is not in my heart, and never has been in my heart, to delay the payment of just claims which the Government owes to the individual employees of the Government.

In the second place, I am induced to withdraw my opposition to it, feeling that I could defeat it if I were so disposed, by the knowledge that within the provisions of that bill is a clause known as the Borah amendment for the relief of people within the reclamation projects. That amendment provides relief for men, women, and children within the reclamation projects of the West who absolutely need protection at the hands of this Government. So that induces me to withdraw my opposition to it.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I assume this attitude very reluctantly, and I think my associates who have united with me in a protest against the treatment of the several States withdraw their opposition somewhat reluctantly. I do so feeling and knowing that the claim of my State, as it has been established by the bureaus of the Government and by the Court of Claims, is absolutely just and ought to be paid; and I feel that, in withdrawing my objection to this bill at this time, we will place our claim at least in a better position for allowance next time.

I make this statement, Mr. President, because I do not want the Senate to feel, and I do not want the country to feel, that in withdrawing my opposition to the bill I recognize for a moment that there is any injustice in the claims asserted by any of the States.

I withdraw my opposition somewhat reluctantly, too, Mr. President, because there is a provision inserted in this bill for the payment of an extra salary to the employees of the Senate and the House. Of course, the Members of the Senate who live near by—those who live within rifle range almost of the Capitol—do not feel as we do about this; but take it in my own case. My secretary is compelled to travel 3,000 miles, and he ought to be paid a little different compensation from that which is paid to some one who lives close at hand.

The result is that in my own case—and I think the Senator from Utah is similarly situated, as are other Senators from the West, if we call for stenographic assistance in the West we must ourselves employ somebody or else pay for the traveling expenses of some one whom we have here. I feel that these employees, Mr. President, ought to be paid, and, but for a feeling of patriotism that leads me to withdraw my opposition to this measure, I feel that I ought to stand here, as I said I would the other day, until doomsday or until justice was rendered by the Senate of the United States and by the House of Representatives of the United States to the people whom they justly owe.

With that statement, I want to say now, in all frankness, that I withdraw my opposition to this measure with very, very great reluctance.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a few moments.

The parliamentary situation of the general deficiency appropriation bill is such that any one Senator can defeat it. In addition to that, I am perfectly satisfied that the majority of the Members of the Senate would be willing to vote against receding from the amendment we are considering, if that course were insisted on, certainly if by doing so there was any possible way of securing what was just and right.

Aside from the State claims, it must be remembered that the employees of the two Houses of Congress have been here for nine months. The rule as to Government employees is that they shall work eight hours. Our employees have been working on an average, I am sure, of 16 hours, working not only all day, but a good part of the night. I undertake to say, Mr. President,

there is not a reputable private employer in any large establishment in the United States who would have been willing to exact extra work which we have exacted from our employees, and not make a generous allowance—more than one month's additional pay—for the extra work required of them. I consider it most ungenerous, unjust, and unreasonable to deny them some allowance for that extra work.

But the allowance of the extra month's pay, Mr. President, is not in exactly the same category with the four State claims. We may defeat the general deficiency bill, but the defeating of it does not secure any recognition for the four State claims or any recognition of the extra work which has been performed by the employees of Congress. All we could do would be to get some revenge, if there be any satisfaction in revenge, on innocent people for what we consider an injustice to us. I am not willing, so far as I am concerned, to play that kind of a game.

I have, after careful consideration, reached the conclusion that there has not been a free and fair conference between the two Houses in respect to this matter; that such a conference has been denied; but that we have no remedy at this session of Congress, and I therefore unite with the chairman of the committee in saying that I am not willing to insist on a course that will do injury to others and accomplish no good for those who, I think, have been badly treated. I therefore say to the Senate very frankly that I think we ought to recede from these amendments.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as in part representing a State that at one time was a portion of the Oregon country I desire to say a word in appreciation of the attitude that has been taken in this matter by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I feel that, in view of the parliamentary situation, he exercised good judgment in abandoning further obstructive tactics against this bill at this time, because, from all appearances, it would be practically impossible for the House of Representatives to recede from the position it has taken on these claims, even if the membership now in attendance upon the other House desired to do so.

A great portion of the amount going to make up the claim which the Senate provided for in favor of the State of Oregon in this bill was expended in the protection of what is now the State of Washington, and the people now occupying that great territory agree with the citizens of the present State of Oregon as to the justice of the claim of the State of Oregon in this regard, and they feel that the Senator from Oregon was justified in the position which, on Saturday night, he stated he would take in regard to this claim, when he said that he would exhaust the resources at his command in order to defeat the bill, if this claim were not agreed to by the two branches of Congress and included in the bill.

I only desired in these few words to put on record an indorsement of the attitude taken throughout this matter by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, in common with the Senators who have been pushing the State claims, I want to say that I have agreed to recede, not that I feel that these claims are not just, not that I feel that the additional amount should not be paid to the employees of the House and the Senate, but I do so in view of the fact that I think not to do so would probably be an injustice to the Members of the Senate who have stayed by us, and it would be an injustice to those who are interested in the deficiency bill. For that reason, and that reason alone, I am willing to recede, but I still maintain that these claims are just and that the additional amount should be paid to the employees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to restate the facts upon which the claim of Texas, which is in this bill, rest. That was fully done, I think, or endeavored to be done in the remarks submitted by me on Saturday night last. Unlike some of the other claims, the claim of Texas had never previously been presented to the Congress and passed upon. All I wanted with reference to this claim was to have a thorough consideration of it and a full and free conference on the part of the conferees of the House of Representatives. As I stated Saturday night, that was denied, not even a consideration of the proposition having been given by the House conferees at that conference.

But, Mr. President, I desire to say, in addition to what has been said by Senators on the subject of the State claims, that, in comparison with one of the issues which is raised in this controversy, they are inconsequential. The State of Texas, as a State, cares very little about the \$217,000 for performing the duties primarily devolving upon the Federal Government by the Constitution. Texas, unaided, won her independence against

Mexico, surrounded, as she was then, by hostile savages and an alien race; and yet I do say that when this small claim was presented, after having been audited by the War Department of the United States, after having followed precedent after precedent in its presentation, it ought to have been adjusted and settled, or, at least, it ought to have been given that fair and generous consideration which Representatives of all the States owe to each State in this Union.

Mr. President, I desire to state, in addition to this and in addition to what has been stated by Senators on this side who have insisted upon the payment of these claims, that there is a larger question involved than the mere payment of these claims. I ask that the Secretary may read from the Record the marked paragraph which I send to the desk, from page 13016, in the debate in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary proceeded to read, and read as follows:

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move the House adhere—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is something which occurred in the House of Representatives, and if it is the purpose of the Senator to criticize it, I make the point of order that it is out of order under the rules. In neither House can any Member animadvert upon the conduct of the other House.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I propose to have read the proceedings which I send to the desk and then to state the effect of those proceedings upon the bill and the possible action of the Senate of the United States. If that is a criticism of another branch of Congress, well and good; but I dare say it will not be treated broadly in that sense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The rule, as I understand, Mr. President—I have not time to find it now—does not use the term "criticism" or even "hostile animadversion."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it will be found in Jefferson's Manual, not in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, Jefferson's Manual is not a part of the rules of the Senate, though it is quite persuasive, very persuasive, of what the rule should be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not only in Jefferson's Manual, but I think the principle is repeated in the rules. I know that the principle is repeated in the rules of the House and I think in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator from Texas means to criticize the House, but simply to state what happened in another place.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not care to state in advance what I intend to say, Mr. President, in order to have a supposititious case presented to the Chair for ruling.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas had already criticized the House and animadverted upon its motives, in a way, and then had asked that there be read a part of the proceedings of the House. A Member of the House of Representatives can not be questioned elsewhere for what he says in the House of Representatives, nor can a Member of the Senate be questioned elsewhere for what he says in the Senate. At any rate, without taking the time to hunt up the particular language of the rule, but relying upon the knowledge of the Presiding Officer as to what it is, I make the point of order that the request of the Senator from Texas is out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, in acting upon the point of order raised, is, unfortunately, not in possession of the nature of the extract which the Senator from Texas has asked to have read.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, what I have said—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I, unfortunately, can not find the rule just at this moment.

Mr. CULBERSON. What I have said here with reference to this matter amounts to this, in substance, that there is a question involved in this controversy above the mere allowance of claims on the part of the States of Virginia, Maryland, Oregon, and Texas, and I propose to state it, preliminary to which I asked that there might be read from the desk an extract from the proceedings of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair always has been of opinion that Jefferson's Manual, so far as it is pertinent, is and has been recognized as a part of the rules of this body, and the Chair finds in Jefferson's Manual this statement:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or to the particular votes or majorities on it there, because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other;

and the quoting of them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

While undoubtedly in debate in this body, and perhaps in the other body, that rule has not been strictly adhered to, yet, the point of order having been made, the Chair feels constrained to sustain it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, on Saturday night, when this matter was before the Senate on the report of the conferees, at least for the time it appeared simply that there was a disagreement between the two Houses with reference to these matters and that they were presented to the House of Representatives by the conferees and such action taken by that body toward a further consideration by the conferees as might be deemed proper; but, instead of that, as I have been credibly informed, after a motion to continue the disagreement of the House to these amendments the extraordinary and unusual procedure was taken of moving to reconsider that action and laying that motion to reconsider on the table.

Now, Mr. President, I am not talking idly when I say that that affront was made to the Senate of the United States, not only denying a further consideration by the other body, but deliberately taking that step for the purpose of preventing the House itself, if it saw proper to do so, to have a continued and further consideration of these subjects by the conferees.

I want to read the statement upon which my information is based that that course was not only taken, but that it was extraordinary and unusual; and I have no doubt it was purposely intended to raise an issue between the Senate and the House of Representatives as to whether the Senate was a coordinate branch of Congress when it came to the making of appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. CULBERSON. It was said there:

This course is unusual—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew the point of order. As I understand, the Chair has ruled on my point of order, and yet the Senator from Texas is proceeding to read what occurred. I find this language in the Precedents and Decisions on Points of Order, Gilfry, page 866:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House—

Necessarily by any Member of the other House—

or the particular votes or majorities on it there—

Of course, the words "or majorities" cover the rules of the House, with which we have nothing to do—

because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independence, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

In the Forty-seventh Congress, second session, Journal, page 430:

The President pro tempore (Mr. David Davis)—

Who is the only politically independent President who has ever presided over this body—

The President pro tempore (Mr. David Davis) decided that it was not in order to refer to any action had in the House of Representatives upon any question not officially communicated to the Senate; and the Senate refused to lay an appeal on the table; yeas 24, nays 26.

In that particular case, it is true, the question of order was withdrawn, but that is not the case here.

April 25, 1894, Mr. Dolph, while addressing the Senate, proceeded to read an extract from a speech delivered in the House of Representatives upon the pending bill.

Which is precisely this case.

Mr. Gray—

Senator Gray, of Delaware, I take it—

Mr. Gray raised a question of order, that it was not in order to quote and comment upon a speech made during the same Congress by a Member of the other House upon the same bill. The Vice President [Mr. Stevenson] sustained the point of order, and decided that it was out of order in debate to notice what had been said on the same subject in the other House upon the bill.

An appeal from the decision was laid on the table—yeas 43, nays 2.

There are other precedents, but those are all I can find on this short notice.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I have expressed no opinion about the rules of the Senate on this subject except to say that Jefferson's Manual is not a part of the rules of this body.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have quoted not only Jefferson's Manual, but the rulings of presiding officers and of the Senate itself.

Mr. CULBERSON. It may be that some presiding officer has so held; and I do not doubt that different presiding officers in this body have held variantly upon many questions; but aside from that, in view of the evidently obstructive policy of my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, I will not detain the Senate with endeavoring to read from the Record what was said in another body. However, I will state that from the public press I have observed that it was stated by the mover of the motion that it was not only unusual to do that, but that it was meant by that to say that the Senate either had to recede from its position or that there would be no deficiency appropriation bill.

So I repeat, the consideration of these claims may be put aside, but the other question presented here is whether the Senate of the United States should assert its right to a full and fair conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, or whether it would have submitted to it the proposition that it must recede from its position or see this so-called supply bill fail of passage by the two Houses.

Now, Mr. President, notwithstanding this graver question, this question affecting the integrity and independence of this body, for reasons which have been stated by Senators who stood with me in this controversy, I will decline further to oppose the adoption of the conference report and will let it be adopted with the hope that some time in its history the Senate of the United States will be manly enough to assert its rights under the Constitution.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on this question I want to take the opportunity to thank the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the Chamber who have served so faithfully, and I may say so strenuously, at this term for their loyal support of the chairman. I think I ought to thank the Senate as a body for the consideration it has shown the Committee on Appropriations. It is true that these large supply bills, which are sometimes passed in 30 to 60 minutes, have at this session been on the floor for two weeks each—sometimes more. But it has seemed always that the more inquiries made the better for the Senate itself and the country, for, on the part of the committee I may say, it has never brought a bill in here that we were not willing not only to sustain, but to explain fully to the Senate.

There has never been a session in the somewhat long service I have rendered where there was anything like the vexatious questions and the long-continued and strenuous sessions in the committee and on the floor that we have had to undergo in the very prolonged session which is to close to-day.

If at any time I have shown impatience in the presentation or consideration of bills, I want to make due apology, and I again want to thank the members of the committee for the good work they have done.

With respect to these claims which we now recede from, I want to say that every matter of that kind ought to have its day. I attach blame to no one, and I do not regret that we spend another day or two here to have the Senate and the country understand the situation. I hope the disputed matter will come up in due course and be settled in the right way hereafter and with the same final good feeling which has characterized the present consideration of it.

I hope the motion to recede will prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate recede from the amendments in disagreement between the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTRA COMPENSATION TO CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I introduce a joint resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States a sum equal to one-twelfth of their annual salaries in lieu of all transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress was read the first time by its title, and the Secretary proceeded to read it the second time at length.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Senators will notice that I have changed the joint resolution, eliminating from it the employees of the House, because I assume that if the Senate favors it the House would not object to our handling this subject, so far as the Senate is concerned, as we see fit.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if he knows whether the House would object to including the House employees?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. We sent to them an amendment of that kind including the employees of the House, and they rejected it. It seems to me the Senate ought to have some rights that a white man is bound to respect at some time. If we adopt this joint resolution with respect to our own employees, I do not think the House would object. I know it ought not to.

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly feel that if our employees are so paid the House employees should be paid.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not observe the language of the joint resolution very closely. In order to accomplish the object the Senator from Oregon wants to accomplish, I suggest that he ought to make it payable out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That can not be done. There is a statute against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will Senators please suspend? The joint resolution has not been read in full.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate borne on the annual and session rolls on the 1st day of July, 1912—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was induced to confine it to the employees of the Senate because in the amendment which was adopted and embodied in the general deficiency bill we included the House employees as well. The House conferees objected to that, and I assume that they would not object to our determining the pay of the employees of the Senate, but would willingly leave it to us to determine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Oregon permit an interruption for just a moment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is a very good thing that the Senator has put the joint resolution in that form. Being a joint resolution, it will have to be sent immediately to the House. I have an abiding confidence in the result. I think the House will offer to amend the resolution by making it apply to House employees also, and if they do and send it back to the Senate, of course we will be very glad to accept the amendment.

I want to express the hope that these people will be provided for. There are numbers of them here from way out West—Utah, and California, and Washington, and Oregon, and out at the base of the Rocky Mountains, and on the Pacific coast, who will have to borrow money to get home unless some sort of arrangement is made. There should be some sort of consideration for this geographical misfortune, or possibly geographical good fortune, I do not know which. I express the hope that the Senate will pass the joint resolution and that it will be amended here or elsewhere so as to include the House employees.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, first I should like to know whether the joint resolution as introduced includes House employees?

Mr. CULLOM. It does not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I prepared the joint resolution very much in the form it was originally submitted, and it was subsequently changed so as to include the House employees. I am entirely in favor of the proposition to include them, but inasmuch as the House conferees have turned down a measure for the relief of the employees of the House, I thought we would put it up to them to reimburse the Senate employees alone. If they want to, they can amend it so as to include the House employees, and I would be perfectly willing, as the Senator from Mississippi says, to have them included. In fact, I would be glad of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. If they turned down a proposition to pay the employees of both the House and the Senate, they would have much greater reason, would they not, to turn down a proposition that contained only the employees of the Senate? It seems to me the joint resolution ought to go over to the House just as it did before, with a proposition to pay the employees of both House and Senate, and then allow the House to vote on it. They can take it up on a single vote, and instead of sending it to conference we will be more likely to get a direct vote in the House on the proposition.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly willing, I will say, to include the employees of the House, and in omitting them I was merely trying to relieve the measure of embarrassment, if I could.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have very little doubt that if we send over a proposition to pay only the employees of the Senate and do not pay the House employees, the House will peremptorily turn it down, whereas, I think, if it contains both, there are some Members of the House who are in favor of paying these sums to their own employees who may have the courage to get up in the House and move the passage of the joint resolution without amendment, and I want them to have that opportunity.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest, then, that the Senator move to amend it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move an amendment so that it shall include the employees of the House as well as of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. House employees and House Office Building employees?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon modify the joint resolution as indicated?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution as modified will be read.

The joint resolution as modified was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House borne on the annual and session rolls on the 30th day of June, 1912, including the employees on the maintenance rolls of the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Capitol police, the official reporters of the Senate and House, and W. A. Smith, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, in lieu of all transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington, for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress, a sum equal to one-twelfth of the annual compensation then paid them by law; and the sum necessary to carry out the provisions of the resolution is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be immediately available.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOURLY FOR FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the adjournment resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 65), which was read and considered, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on the 25th day of August, 1912, at 3 o'clock a. m.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to submit an amendment, so that it may be dated as of to-day and the hour be 4.30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming moves to amend the concurrent resolution. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the word "twenty-fifth" and insert "twenty-sixth," and strike out "3 o'clock a. m." and insert "4.30 o'clock p. m."

Mr. WARREN. I desire to ask a parliamentary question, and that is whether the Chair thinks it necessary to have appointed a committee to wait upon the President before the resolution is finally passed. I do not think it is necessary, but I want to ask what the rule is upon that point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. The inquiry is whether the resolution should be passed before a committee has been nominated to wait upon the President and have returned and reported from the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that while ordinarily such action is first taken, it is not at all necessary.

Mr. WARREN. That is the thought I had. It is unusual, but the condition is unusual, and we are through; the work is brought up to the present moment. I understand the enrolling clerks have everything enrolled, except one or two matters that have passed very recently. I understand the Chief Executive of the Nation will not be far away, to meet the committee, and I understand consideration has been had of all measures except those passed this morning. Hence I assume we would be safe in passing the resolution at this time, so that the House may have notice of the amendment.

But the suggestion I made to the Chair was merely to make sure that we were proceeding in the orderly way, a course which, while not perhaps in pursuance of the practice of the Senate, is justified by the unusual circumstances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. CULLOM. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration. I desire to state that I hope my name will not be considered in connection with the appointment of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 387) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States, and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks to be excused from serving on the committee, and the Chair will appoint the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. NELSON. It is necessary to have a brief executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

At 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m. Mr. McCUMBER and Mr. MARTIN of Virginia appeared and—

Mr. McCUMBER said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Senate to act in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the other House to wait upon the President and inform him that Congress has closed its labors and is ready to adjourn, unless the President should have some further communication to make to Congress, begs leave to report that it has performed that duty, and has been informed by the President of the United States that he has no further communication to make to Congress.

RECESS.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m., when it reassembled.

EXTRA COMPENSATION TO SENATE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have been informed—and, I assume, correctly—that one of the two great parties in the other House had a caucus some time ago, and in that caucus determined certain matters relating to the number and compensation of their employees. I concede the right of the House of Representatives to determine the number and compensation of their employees, but I think the Senate has the same control over its employees. I question the right, not of the House but the right of one party in the House, to dictate as to the employment or the compensation of employees of the Senate or as to the provision for mileage which the Senate may see fit to grant to its own employees. We have passed a joint resolution which covered both the employees of the House and of the Senate. That has not been acted upon by the House; and, as I am informed, it was not acted upon because the majority of the House considered that they were bound by their caucus agreement. Inasmuch, however, as the caucus agreement could only properly cover matters in the other House and could not apply to the Senate and in order that the matter may be brought before the two Houses as to the right of the Senate to pass upon the question of its own employees, I shall offer the joint resolution which we have already passed, but relating only to the employees of the Senate, with the hope that it may be immediately passed and go over to the House. If they do not act upon it at this session, at least it will be before them, so that it can be immediately acted upon at the beginning of the next session. I offer the joint resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate of the United States a sum equal to one-twelfth of their annual salaries in lieu of all transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate borne on the annual and

session rolls on the 30th day of June, 1912, including the employees on the maintenance roll of the Senate Office Building, the Capitol police appointed by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the official reporters of the Senate, and W. A. Smith, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, in lieu of all transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress a sum equal to one-twelfth of the annual compensation then paid them by law, and the sum necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; the same to be immediately available.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I simply desire to ask if it is not practicable to make this a Senate resolution? Why is it necessary to make it a joint resolution?

Mr. McCUMBER. Because, if it were a simple Senate resolution, the money could only be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and we have not a sufficient amount in the contingent fund of the Senate to pay it.

Mr. CULBERSON. In addition to that, I understand a resolution of that kind would be void because it is against existing law.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Texas is correct. It could not be paid out of the Senate contingent fund for two reasons: There is not money enough available with which to pay it, and it would be against the law to do so except both Houses joined in a measure which acted as a waiver.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THANKS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, in submitting for the consideration of the Senate the resolution I am about to present I wish to avail myself of the opportunity to express the sincere regret of Senators on this side of the Chamber, and I am sure likewise those on the other, for the illness which has detained the Vice President from his place as Presiding Officer of this body, and to express the hope that he may be speedily restored to health.

I now offer the resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 386) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Hon. JAMES S. SHERMAN, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the dignified, impartial, and courteous manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the present session.

THANKS TO THE PRESIDENTS PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to introduce a formal resolution extending the thanks of the Senate to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], who have, during the absence of the Vice President, owing to an unfortunate illness, which we all most sincerely regret, respectively occupied the chair as President pro tempore of the Senate. I have, however, been advised that in the absence of the Vice President it would hardly be proper to introduce a formal resolution. I therefore take occasion in this informal manner to express, not only for myself, but I am sure I am warranted in saying in behalf of all my colleagues on both sides of this Chamber, their and my high appreciation for the kind, courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which those Senators have respectively discharged the trying duties of the chair during the period when they have presided over the deliberations of the Senate.

I desire also, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my associates in the Senate, to assure these distinguished gentlemen that they have our best wishes for their happiness and welfare, to wish them a safe return to their homes, and to express the hope that when Congress again reassembles they may return to their duties in vigorous and robust health. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The hour of 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. having arrived, the President pro tempore (Mr. GALLINGER) said:

Senators, the hour for final adjournment has arrived. Expressing the sincere hope that you may all reach your homes in safety, that you may have a pleasant vacation, and that upon the resumption of your duties there may be no vacancies in your ranks, I now declare the present session of the Senate adjourned without day.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 26, 1912.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. William J. Nicholson, Seventh Cavalry, to be colonel from August 24, 1912.

(Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved Mar. 3, 1911, nominated for advancement in grade in accordance with the rank he would have been entitled to hold had promotion been lineal throughout his arm since the date of his entry into the arm to which he permanently belongs.)

Lieut. Col. Robert D. Read, Third Cavalry, to be colonel from August 24, 1912, vice Col. Edgar Z. Steever, Fourth Cavalry, appointed brigadier general.

Maj. Tyree R. Rivers, Cavalry (detailed inspector general), to be lieutenant colonel from August 24, 1912, vice Lieut. Col. Robert D. Read, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Charles D. Rhodes, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be major from August 26, 1912, vice Maj. John M. Jenkins, Fifth Cavalry, detailed as inspector general on that date.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Louis R. Dougherty, Fifth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from August 22, 1912, vice First Lieut. John C. Maul, Fifth Field Artillery, detached from his proper command.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant paymasters in the Navy from the 22d day of August, 1912, to fill vacancies created by the act of Congress approved that date:

William E. Moorman, a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Ernest H. Barber, a citizen of Kentucky;
Josiah G. Venter, a citizen of New York;
Harry T. Sandlin, a citizen of Massachusetts;
Oscar W. Leidel, a citizen of Illinois;
Arthur H. Eddins, midshipman, United States Navy;
Stanley M. Mathes, a citizen of South Dakota; and
Delos P. Heath, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS.

MINNESOTA.

Frederick W. Betz to be postmaster at Fairmont, Minn., in place of Edgar B. Shanks. Incumbent's commission expired March 14, 1910.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 26, 1912.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant paymasters:

William E. Moorman.
Ernest H. Barber.
Josiah G. Venter.
Harry T. Sandlin.
Oscar W. Leidel.
Arthur H. Eddins.
Stanley M. Mathes.
Delos P. Heath.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY.

Lieut. Col. Robert D. Read, to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. William J. Nicholson, to be colonel.
Maj. Tyree R. Rivers, to be lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Charles D. Rhodes, to be major.
Second Lieut. Louis R. Dougherty, to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Shipwith Coale, Jackson.

ARIZONA.

Harry C. Adams, Hayden.

MINNESOTA.

Frederick W. Betz, Fairmont.

TEXAS.

Dallas Harbert, Commerce.
Benjamin M. Sheldon, Rockport.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, August 26, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Trusting in Thy loving kindness, O God, our Father, we draw near to Thee, not as we would, but, as we are able, we bring to Thee our devout offerings. Let Thy blessing, we beseech Thee, descend in full measure upon us now that these Thy servants may be guided by divine light in all the resolves and enactments of this day, that those whom they represent may be faithfully served to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 24, 1912, was read and approved.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. If a motion should be made to adjourn sine die and it developed there was no quorum, could the House adjourn?

The SPEAKER. Well, the emergency has not arisen. We will cross that bridge when we reach it.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman proceeds with his question of personal privilege the Clerk will read the following telegram.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEADVILLE, PA., August 26, 1912.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I respectfully ask leave of absence for the remainder of session on account of serious illness in family.

ARTHUR L. BATES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania rises to a question of personal privilege, which he will state.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this being District day, I desire to ask for the consideration of some District measures.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman later.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire upon what subject the gentleman proposes to discourse?

Mr. MANN. It is in reply to a speech inserted in the Record by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], who is here.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, inasmuch as my colleague is here and amply able to take care of himself, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record by myself relating to—

The SPEAKER. Let us get through with this other matter. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday last the gentleman from Alabama—I understand we are not to mention the names of Members in parliamentary discussions.

The SPEAKER. Oh, no; there is no such rule as that.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] inserted under leave to print an attack upon me. I say it was unworthy, because it was made by slipping it into the Record a few hours before what was supposed to be time for adjournment of the session, which ordinarily would have left no opportunity to meet this assault on the floor of the House. The remarks are dated June 19, more than two months ago, and that length of time before I ever uttered a word on this floor in criticism of the failure of the majority to take action on the immigration bills, and which criticism I only offered because I see everywhere in Pennsylvania the evils of too much immigration, and because I have been overwhelmed with the

evidence of the feeling among the people through the medium of communications from the Patriotic Order Sons of America, the Junior Order of American Mechanics, and the attitude of the American Federation of Labor. The assertions of the gentleman are unworthy of any Member of this body, not only because they vilify, but because the author has been caught in the act of attempting to fire and run away.

At no time have I ever indulged in personal invective on this floor, much less smuggle vituperation into the Record at the moment of supposed adjournment, nor will I now or at any time stoop to mudslinging which is approached in the alleged speech of the gentleman from Alabama. Language was quoted and imputed to me and the provisions of my immigration bill which will not be found in the measure as introduced.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FOCHT. This sort of posthumous speech, virtually smuggled into the Record, contains some rancor, but this I will not countenance in what I have to say; and instead of slipping a reply into the Record under unanimous consent, to be under cover until after adjournment, I have written a letter to the gentleman from Alabama, advising him of my intention to reply, so that he might be here to prove his assertions or observe the proprieties of this House and the duty of a gentleman and retract by expunging the injurious statements.

I submit the following letter, addressed to the gentleman, Mr. BURNETT, of Alabama:

[Sixty-second Congress. DAVID E. FINLEY, South Carolina, chairman; HENRY A. BARNHART, Indiana; BENJAMIN K. FOCHT, Pennsylvania.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1912.

Hon. JOHN L. B. BURNETT, M. C.,
Congress Hall Hotel, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg to inform you that I shall rise to a question of personal privilege to-day upon the convening of the House and call attention to your unwarranted remarks about me and the immigration bill I introduced and had referred to your committee.

Meanwhile, I beg to ask you to look into the provisions of my bill and the original immigration commission bill introduced in the Senate by Senator DILLINGHAM and see if either would have admitted the Chinese. I beg to call your attention to the fact that my bill, without qualification or limitation, excluded all persons ineligible to naturalization. The qualification you have in mind and which you attribute to me and my bill was not contained in the bill I introduced or Senator DILLINGHAM introduced, but was an amendment put on in the Senate February 14 and further amended April 15. You are absolutely wrong in every one of your other statements as you are in the Chinese one.

Very truly, yours,

B. K. FOCHT.

The unanswerable and incontrovertible facts are these:

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday, August 24, 1912 (pp. 756-758 of Appendix), is a "Speech of Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, of Alabama, in the House of Representatives," purporting to have been delivered "Wednesday, June 19, 1912," or over two months ago, which contains personal statements about me and about a bill which I introduced last January and had referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which the gentleman from Alabama is chairman.

The words and sentences which I will quote could not have been in the gentleman's mind, and no words were further from his thought upon the 19th of June than were the unwarranted statements about me which he obsessed himself in Saturday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and which were never spoken on this floor. Last Saturday was supposed to be the last legislative day. Every Member of this House expected it to be. By mere chance, the merest accident, the House did not adjourn without day last Saturday, and by the merest accident and the merest chance I happened to see yesterday what the gentleman from Alabama had slipped into Saturday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of a purported speech delivered in this House two months ago.

I call the attention of the Speaker and the House to the following statements (p. 757 of Appendix):

Mr. FOCHT, of Pennsylvania, introduced one (immigration bill), which in many respects follows the Dillingham bill, but which for confusion and amateurishness is more of a joke than a real bill. It covered 53 pages and contained 39 sections. I doubt whether the author ever read it, but allowed some shrewd joker to impose upon him. He did not ask me for a hearing by our committee on this bill, and possibly only introduced it for home consumption. The last section of the bill also repeals the Chinese-exclusion act and if enacted would soon fill our country with Asiatics, who would drive every white laborer to the poorhouse. There are more than 400,000,000 Chinese in that Kingdom, and they could easily spare 200,000,000 of them. This would be more than twice the entire population of all America. It is unthinkable that any sane man would want to turn loose this great horde of "chinks" on our country.

And then the gentleman from Alabama goes on to comment:

What do you think of that? A medical examination to determine whether or not an alien can read and write. This is a fair sample of much of the Focht bill. Does he not himself need a medical examination?

In the first place, the gentleman from Alabama has inserted in fine print as part of the sentence he purports to quote from my bill, at line 19, on page 15, nine words which are not to be found in the bill. I suppose he will proffer the excuse that the nine words between the two dashes is the work of the printer and that they ought to have been put in larger type and distinguished.

The gentleman says he was made the victim of the printer. That is my answer to his ludicrous "competent medical examination" point. The bill which the gentleman does me the honor to call the Focht bill is identically the same, line for line and word for word, with the exception of seven interlineations, as the Dillingham or Immigration Commission bill. I took the identical bill Senator DILLINGHAM introduced—S. 3175—after it was printed in the Senate and introduced it in the House on January 19, with certain changes I thought desirable. The gentleman is far at sea when he says my bill differs from the original Dillingham bill. I presume attention was called to that typographical error by the agents and attorneys for the foreign steamship companies when he allowed them to come before his committee and express their fears that the Chinese-exclusion acts would be repealed, something they have been working for here in Washington and through the public press for years.

I say again, my bill is identical, word for word, line for line, page for page, and section for section, with the one exception of one section, section 31, which I added in order to repeal the present division of information and display, or employment bureau of aliens, and six little verbal changes. One of these, called attention to by the gentleman in connection with the phrase "competent medical examination," that did not connect with the printer, kept the precise phrase of the original bill prepared by the experts of the gentleman's Immigration Commission, instead of deciphering my interlineation, which was "medical or other competent examination."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. Have I used 15 minutes, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask to continue until I am through.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I asked leave to interrupt the gentleman awhile ago, and I have got the veto power—[Laughter.]

Mr. FOCHT. I surrender.

Mr. CLAYTON (continuing). And unless the gentleman agrees that I may interrupt him, I shall object.

Mr. FOCHT. I surrender.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, then, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to continue to complete his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. FOCHT. Well, I would like to complete this—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman if this is not a fact. I think there is a misunderstanding between him and the gentleman from Alabama. Both gentlemen are in favor of restricting immigration. I know that, and the House knows that I favor it. The fact is that the gentleman's bill was the Immigration Commission bill. He probably introduced it just as we all introduced our bills—as a foundation on which those who desire a restricted immigration might commence to work.

Mr. FOCHT. That is the way I introduced the bill; exactly as it came from the Senate. I mean to explain, having it all in chronological order.

The bill is a long one and instead of finding fault with any part of its construction, and especially since it was made by the experts of his own commission, the gentleman would be of more patriotic service to his country if he would have had passed some immigration legislation through this House this session. The gentleman dare not deny that there has not been an understanding with the chairman of the Rules Committee and the leaders of the House, for the correspondence published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows it to be so, that has resulted in the suppression of all immigration legislation this session, and may mean the ultimate defeat next winter. And this bill which passed the Senate four months ago has been in the hands of the gentleman from Alabama ever since. The fear that it

may be strangled in conference has been expressed by such able Democrats as Congressmen RODDENBERRY and DIES, who have raised their voices in protest on this floor, which is something my friend from Alabama has not yet done.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FOCHT. I decline to yield.

Mr. BURNETT. It is my time next.

Mr. FOCHT. Very well. I challenge and brand as a misapprehension the statement made by the gentleman that I introduced this bill for "home consumption," a phrase worn out and indicating impoverishment of the power of expression. My bill would not repeal the Chinese-exclusion act and admit the "chinks" as he says it would. The gentleman must know his error. Section 3 of my bill contains a far better Chinese-exclusion act than the existing one. I call the gentleman's attention to section 3, where it says, page 7, that "all persons who are not eligible to become citizens of the United States by naturalization" are excluded. The gentleman must have been depending too much upon specious arguments for his information about the contents of my bill, for if he had ever read it he would have found that section 3 is far stronger than the existing Chinese-exclusion laws. The gentleman certainly knows that a Chinaman or person of the Asiatic or Mongolian race can not become a citizen by naturalization. Medical examinations are to be sought rather than to be abhorred. They are a good thing for literates and illiterates, and I do not object to the gentleman's statement about my favoring medical examinations for immigrants, for every one of them, and the gentleman knows that that is what quarantine is for, that and fumigation.

The gentleman's committee held hearings all last year and has been holding them all this year, and I find from a perusal of the published hearings of both years that practically the same persons appeared before the committee each time. Each time it was the same old line-up, with countenance and speech the same. The Senate committee went ahead and did business, while the gentleman's committee, under his direction, held hearings and did nothing at all effective. With all the time and opportunity offered they have not put a single bill through which looks to excluding undesirables, although promises have been profuse.

An apparently sincere fight was made two years ago, when the gentleman from Alabama abused Republicans, characterizing them as hypocrites and worse, but when he comes in full control himself, as indicated recently by the Democratic leader, he does nothing and gets nothing done in response to the call heard from every quarter of the country.

The misrepresentation of me, whether designedly or not, in regard to Chinese immigration is shown by the facts in the case. In section 3 of the bill I introduced is a provision which would have better excluded the Chinese than they are now. There is an illiteracy test in that section that could have been made to help do the work also. There are other provisions in that section as well as the one debarring absolutely all who can not be naturalized. The bill I introduced, which the gentleman in a far cry has tried to find a petty fault or two with, would have kept out the Chinese, and this has been so stated to me in correspondence I had with the State Department, but which, owing to the injunction of the department, I can not make public. However, I will be glad to show the letters to any Member who does not need "a guardian" and who does not listen to the whisperings of the foreign steamship companies and cheap labor importers and employers. The correspondence was started by the department. The Assistant Secretary wrote me at once, after I introduced the immigration commission bill, stating that he had correspondence with Senator DILLINGHAM and the Senate committee, and suggested that my bill went too far in excluding and keeping out the Chinese. He wrote the same kind of a letter to Senator DILLINGHAM about his bill. Mr. Speaker, in this connection I wish to say that I prefer the opinion of the State Department to that of the gentleman from Alabama, which seems to be the view and attitude held and argued by the agents and representatives of the foreign steamship companies and large cheap labor employers and alien interests.

I know the bill was recommitted in the Senate February 14, 1912, in order to change the phrase excluding all persons not eligible to naturalization in section 3 and soften it down, and on April 15 it was again recommitted to stiffen it up. The arguments of the steamship people about the changed wording being "involved" and "bungling" seems to have convinced some, but it did not convince the Senate committee or a majority of that body.

Mr. Speaker. I have here letters written by the attorneys for the American Federation of Labor, with regard to this Chinese matter. Copies of the letter of March 2, 1912, refer not to the

original provision in the original bill or as contained in the bill reported to the Senate on January 18, but to the phrase "unless otherwise provided for by treaties, conventions, or by agreements as to passports":

RALSTON, SIDONS & RICHARDSON,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1912.

Mr. ARTHUR E. HOLDER,
Mr. JOHN A. MOFFITT,
Mr. J. D. PIERCE,

Legislative Committee American Federation of Labor.

GENTLEMEN: You have asked us as to the bearing of Senate bill No. 3175, entitled "To regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," upon the matter of the exclusion of Chinese from the country, and in reply we have to say:

The bill referred to, in its section 3, enumerating the persons or classes of persons to be excluded from admission to the United States mentions, among others, "persons who are not eligible to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by treaties, conventions, or by agreements as to passports." The same proposed bill, by its section 39, repeals "all laws relating to the exclusion of Chinese persons, or persons of Chinese descent, except such provisions thereof as may relate to the naturalization of aliens," and is to take effect from July 1, 1912. The provision relative to the naturalization of aliens and intended to be referred to in the proposed act is contained in section 14 of the act of May 6, 1882 (22 Stat. L., p. 58), and reads as follows:

"SEC. 14. That hereafter no State court or court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

The result of the foregoing is that if the admission of Chinese who are not eligible to become citizens of the United States is provided for by the treaties, they must be so admitted, all of our existing Chinese-exclusion laws being proposed to be repealed. Let us see, therefore, if the treaties provide for the admission of Chinese in the absence of express prohibitive language.

The Burlingame treaty of 1868 recognized the full right on the part of the Chinese to enter, travel, and reside in the United States, the articles controlling the matter being as follows:

"ART. V. The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from the one country to the other for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents. The high contracting parties therefore join in reprobating any other than an entirely voluntary emigration for these purposes. They consequently agree to pass laws making it a penal offense for a citizen of the United States or Chinese subjects to take Chinese subjects either to the United States or to any other foreign country, or for a Chinese subject or citizen of the United States to take citizens of the United States to China or to any other foreign country without their free and voluntary consent, respectively."

"ART. VI. Citizens of the United States visiting or residing in China shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, or exemptions in respect to travel or residence as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most-favored nation; and, reciprocally, Chinese subjects visiting or residing in the United States shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, and exemptions in respect to travel or residence as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most-favored nation. But nothing herein contained shall be held to confer naturalization upon citizens of the United States in China, nor upon the subjects of China in the United States."

These provisions have never been abrogated by treaty, but have only been modified by the treaty of 1880, one of the recitals of which is as follows:

"Whereas the Government of the United States, because of the constantly increasing emigration of Chinese laborers to the territory of the United States and the embarrassments consequent upon such emigration, now desires to negotiate a modification of the existing treaties which shall not be in direct contravention of their spirit."

Article 1 explains the principal modification proposed, and the only one of importance so far as our present purposes are concerned. This reads as follows:

"Whenever, in the opinion of the Government of the United States, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country, or of any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations. Legislation taken in regard to Chinese laborers will be of such a character only as is necessary to enforce the regulation, limitation, or suspension of immigration, and immigrants shall not be subject to personal maltreatment or abuse."

It will be noted, as a result of the foregoing, that, according to the treaties between the two countries—and the only right of exclusion given by a bill has to be in conformity with the treaties—Chinese laborers are given the right of free admission to the United States until and unless, in the opinion of the Government of this country, their coming or residence affects or threatens to affect the interests of this country, or to endanger its good order, or that of any locality within its territory, when, and in no other event, it is agreed that the Government of the United States "may regulate," limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it.

When Congress passed the exclusion act in 1882, it introduced it with the following recital:

"Whereas, in the opinion of the Government of the United States, the coming of the Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof," following, as will be seen, with exactness, the language of the treaty of 1880. The subsequent exclusion acts are simply a continuation of this act, the ones particularly extending or affecting the time of prohibition being those of May 5, 1892 (27 Stat. L., p. 25), and April 29, 1902 (32 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 176).

With this state of facts as to the treaties and laws, the question before us is simple, and may be summed up as follows:

The treaties provide for the free admission of Chinese in the absence of certain specific findings of fact by the Government of the United States. It is proposed that the Congress shall repeal the laws containing such findings. Immediately upon this action being taken we

revert to the condition which existed immediately consequent upon the signing of the Burlingame treaty of 1868, the modification proposed to that treaty by the treaty of 1880 and itself dependent upon the action of the Government of the United States not being invocable because of the failure of the Government to act or, more strictly speaking, because of the revocation by the Government of the United States of its former action. The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible that if the pending bill becomes enacted in its present form, the right of Chinese to come to this country will be absolutely unrestricted.

We do not discuss the meaning of the qualifying words "unless otherwise provided for by treaties, conventions, or by agreements as to passports" in their relations to Japanese immigration. This for the reason that although it has become public property that passport understandings exist between the United States and Japan controlling the coming of Japanese laborers to the United States. Such passport agreements have never officially been made public property, and in this sense legislation with respect to them is legislation in the dark, so far as the general public may be concerned.

If, however, the idea is to remain in any shape, it might be embodied as follows:

"Provided, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor may recognize the possession of Japanese passports as entitling the proper holder thereof to admission."

Very respectfully, yours,

RALSTON, SIDDOES & RICHARDSON.

This phrase is not to be found in my bill, as the gentleman would know if he had ever read it. I defy him to find the phrase. I challenge any Member of this House or any person to contend for a minute that my bill in excluding all persons ineligible to naturalization does not go further than existing exclusion acts. The gentleman from Alabama must himself be the victim of a joker or was confused when, in an amateurish way under the cover of a supposed dying congressional session, he fired his shot. When the gentleman talked, or rather wrote into his speech of June 19, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 24, those words which were absolutely foreign to his argument on that 19th of June in favor of a larger immigration station at Baltimore in order that more immigrants might be brought in at a southern port—when he wrote those sentences into his remarks about me and my bill he was stating, what was to say the least, a misconception, for he said my bill would let in the Chinese.

He is woefully mistaken, and has predicated his attack not on my bill nor the original Senate bill, but on an amendment to the phrase excluding persons ineligible to become citizens, that provided: "Unless otherwise provided for by treaties, conventions, or by agreements as to passports." I admit that were such a phrase in my bill following the other it would result in repealing the law, so far as absolute exclusion is concerned, and place the discretionary power in the hands of the President to exclude or not to exclude. But there is no such phrase in my bill. It was some such phrase the State Department endeavored to have me accept as an amendment to my bill, but I wrote them in February saying I believed in Chinese exclusion, and that I did not believe in going halfway about it or giving the Executive any discretionary power in the premises, preferring to strengthen rather than to weaken our present exclusion laws. The gentleman from Alabama is altogether mistaken—is in absolute error—when he says my bill would let down the bars to the Chinese. It would not. It would put them up. He has evidently not read my bill. He has probably taken some one's suggestion without looking into the chronological order of this immigration legislation, with which he ought to be entirely familiar. I challenge the gentleman to find the phrase attributed to me and my bill. I call upon him to point it out now and here. He can not do it. I have the bills here. I have the bill I introduced. I have the bill that was reported to the Senate. I have the bill that was first introduced by Senator DILLINGHAM. I have the bill that was reported after it had been recommended, February 14, and that is the amendment the gentleman is apparently talking and thinking about and under which he has covered his assaults upon me. That bill and the next reprint of it are the ones. The amendments in those bills are not contained in my bill, and correspondence with the State Department, had in January and February, shows that I refused to put or agree to have put in my bill the words which might have given the President discretion to let the bars down to the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, I think I know what ails the gentleman from Alabama and why he inserted thoughts in his speech of June 19, which was published in Saturday's RECORD, which he did not have in the June remarks. Just one week ago to-day the gentleman assured me, in regard to an inquiry on this floor, which is in the RECORD, that the immigration bill, which he asked to have passed over and not considered, would be reached and considered this session. Mr. Speaker, I did not then believe it would be, and so intimated; and it has not. I secured permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and did extend them, criticizing the gentleman for his failure to press immigration legislation, and quoted Members on his side of the House to show that there was what amounted, in my opinion, to an understand-

ing to suppress any consideration of immigration restriction this session and probably its ultimate defeat next session.

I was absolutely right in my opinion and the gentleman's assurance then given me has proved to be worthless and wrong. That arrangement may work and it may not. My Democratic friends may catch the foreign vote and they may not. To my mind, questions of state and one as transcendent as this should not turn on any such practical politics. This Democratic House should have had the courage and risen to the patriotic level that inspired and actuated the Republican Senate when on the 19th of last April it passed this Dillingham immigration commission bill. Two years ago the gentleman from Alabama was unsparing in his denunciation of the Republicans then in control of this House for not considering immigration legislation, even though the congressional commission, of which he was a member, had not finished its work, and said that he did not consider that fact or any other sufficient reason for not considering such legislation in view of the alarming immigration evils. No such excuse exists to-day. The commission of which he was a member has reported. The Senate has passed its bill, but the gentleman from Alabama, in charge of immigration affairs of this House, has not brought this bill up for consideration. He has not raised his voice with other Democratic Members of this body in criticism of the suppression of this legislation. Therefore my criticism directed to him as the responsible chairman, being free from any personal feeling or invective, was altogether warranted and did not justify the strictures indulged in by the gentleman in his retort. What is the influence or interest that has prevented the consideration of these bills? What is the mystery that envelops this whole business, anyway? I have seen some telegrams and other data which might in part explain, but I am not going into these matters now. But time will tell and the mysteries attending the stranglehold which has anchored these bills in committee or at the foot of the calendar will be unveiled.

The gentleman's assurance, given me in answer to my question a week ago, as to whether the immigration bill, then withdrawn, would be passed, was that in his opinion it would be. I do not think that I am guilty of going too far by saying that I was disappointed—I hope that is moderate enough—that the bill has not been passed. I only trust that the promises of the Democratic Party might be ultimately fulfilled next December, and that the gentleman from Alabama may have all credit for any labor and effort in behalf of this immigration legislation. No one will write a more exalted editorial for his newspaper than I will, or anybody who is interested in relieving this country of this awful condition.

I just recently received a letter from a brother in Connecticut—and I am sorry that my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who has much to say on these questions, is not here. My brother in his letter told me he knew of a gentleman who had walked the streets of New Haven a distance of three squares, inquiring of every gentleman he met where the courthouse was, and no one could answer him in those three squares except a colored man, an American. I trust that gentlemen on the other side who are not familiar with conditions in Pennsylvania might enact this proposed legislation. I trust and want to believe that you are sincere, and that it may be a good thing for you to eliminate it from politics at the present time, and that next year the Dillingham bill, or the Burnett bill, or some bill, may go through promptly and without opposition, and that the results will be just as we anticipated and hoped for.

In conclusion, I trust I may always be the good-natured gentleman described by my friend from New York [Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL], and that no man may do more or try to do more in this cause than I; but at the same time I shall always resent the impeachment of anybody, either the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] or anybody else, if necessary to reach the truth, which is all I have been trying to do to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have unanimous consent for time to conclude my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] asks unanimous consent—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better fix a limit.

Mr. BURNETT. Say, 20 minutes. I have not prepared my speech on Sunday and have no essay to read, but will make it as brief as I can.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the essay of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] with a great deal of interest, and I am sorry that any gentleman made the

point of order as to the language that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHR] was using; because while I do not desire the name of one who bandies billingsgate with anyone versed in that line of argument, I would have been very glad to have had the opportunity at least to have replied in kind.

The gentleman has referred to the fact that on the 19th of June, in the discussion of the Baltimore immigration matter, I asked to extend my remarks in regard to this question of immigration. That is true, and perhaps the statements that I have made in regard to the gentleman's bill would not have appeared in my speech but for the fact that on the 19th day of this month he asked to extend his remarks in the Record, late in the session, as everybody knew, when the Record was cumbersome and cumbered, and it was not expected that people would read the Record much, and he slipped into the Record a speech by the unanimous-consent process that he has so much deprecated in me. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a few of the remarks of the gentleman in that speech which was never delivered, especially those directed against me. On page 12329 of the Record he says, in referring to the report of the Immigration Commission:

The official investigating body created by Congress and composed of Congressmen, that was conducting its inquiry two years ago, has made its report, and that report is now available.

The Republican Senate of this Congress has acted. Its Committee on Immigration reported the 18th of last January an excellent bill, 58 pages long, that had been drawn by the experts of that commission and which contained practically every piece of legislation recommended by that commission.

Now, I would like very much to have the gentleman inform me what expert of that commission drafted that bill. The commission expired last January a year ago. There were no experts that I knew anything about. If there has been experts, certainly as a member of that commission, if it is true that the experts drew the gentleman's bill, I ought to have had that action by the expert submitted to me, but the experts upon whom the gentleman relies never did that, and I do not know to this day that it is a bill drawn by any expert. I deny it, and I think when I read something from the bill you will say, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that it was an amateur who drew it and not an expert.

It was on the 18th of January that the Committee on Immigration of the Senate reported the bill. The gentleman complains of the committee of which I have the honor of being chairman about the delay that we made in the reporting of the Dillingham bill. That bill was never reported by the Senate until Congress had been in session a month and a half, and when it was reported, although our commission had recommended that the most feasible manner of restricting undesirable immigration was by the reading and writing test, and although there were two members of that commission on the Senate Committee on Immigration, in some way—I do not charge that the gentleman had anything to do with that—that bill was reported with the illiteracy test stricken out entirely, and for that reason it simply amounted to nothing, so far as its restrictive elements were concerned.

Now, how long did the Senate hold it? I desire to contrast the time within which our committee took action upon it and the time that the Senate itself took action. Although when the bill was passed there were only 8 or 10 against it, yet it was not until April 19 that that Senate bill passed, and on April 20 it came to our committee.

The gentleman states that we gave audience to representatives of steamship companies and others who were opposed to restriction of immigration. We gave three days to those who were opposing the Root amendment and to those who were in favor of the Root amendment and those who were opposed to a clause in the Dillingham bill which required that certificates should be provided to people upon their landing. I stated to the speakers before our committee, although occasionally they would break over, that already we had reported what was known as the Burnett bill, which stood straight by the illiteracy test, and that that question should not be discussed; and it seems to me that is the only way we could really do it, if they really desired to restrict immigration. Some months before that time the Burnett bill had been reported, on April 16.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. What was the Root amendment, to which the gentleman made reference?

Mr. BURNETT. I have it here, but I will give the gentleman the amendment in substance. It was one which allowed the deportation of aliens who were in this country and who were trying to organize strenuous opposition to organized government. That is substantially it. There was much opposition to it. There were members of the committee who believed that if the Root amendment were adopted and people, without trial by

jury or trial by courts, merely upon the ipse dixit of the immigration inspector, were deported, then the Russian rulers would have their spies all over this country, and they would trump up charges against people from that country, some of them probably splendid Jewish people, and without trial they would be deported for the purpose of having condign punishment meted out to them on the other side. There were many members of the committee who did not believe that amendment ought to be passed. The other proposition required that those who came to this country to land should be compelled to have an identification certificate. That was opposed by many people, and before us we had the distinguished commissioner of immigration from Ellis Island, where most of these people come. That gentleman stated, and it is in the Record, that if any such thing as that were required these people would lose the certificate before they got outside of the building, and it would be absolutely useless and perhaps make trouble for many a poor fellow who could not produce it. Those were the two things mainly on which we held the hearings. The gentleman says it was the representatives of the steamship company that appeared before us. I am not in touch or in the confidence of the steamship companies and hence can not say, as the gentleman seems to speak from knowledge or some information that he relies upon, that it was the steamship companies that appeared before us.

Let me read what he says in regard to it:

The immigration committee of the Republican Senate industriously considered the bill, while the gentleman's committee as industriously pigeonholed the very same immigration bill which I myself introduced and had referred to the gentleman's committee seven months ago, as I have said, and where my measure still remains unconsidered and unreported to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I am going directly to call attention to the gentleman's bill and then see whether that committee did not do right, especially in view of the fact that the gentleman never thought enough of his bill to ask for a hearing upon it. He talked to me a time or two in regard to whether immigration legislation would be reported, but never cared enough for his bill to ask for its consideration. Already the bill which I introduced had been reported, and I immediately filed a resolution asking for a rule to have it considered by the House, and when the Dillingham bill was considered for several days, on motion of a gentleman—I shall not say who he was, though I do not think he would object—the unanimous opinion of those who were in favor of restriction was that the Dillingham bill should be stricken out, after the enacting clause, and the Burnett bill should be reported in its place.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I presume the gentleman refers to me?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct in his statement. I have no objection to his referring to me.

Mr. BURNETT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. No one can question the sincerity or the interest of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who has fought with me for years and years to try and secure restrictive legislation. It seemed best, in order to expedite the legislation that all after the enacting clause of the Dillingham bill should be stricken out and that the Burnett bill should be reported. When that was done I again introduced a resolution before the Committee on Rules asking that what my distinguished friend has been kind enough to denominate the Burnett-Dillingham bill might be taken up in order that consideration might be given to it. I urged members of the Rules Committee to report the bill. There were gentlemen upon each side of the House, and I believe I am safe in saying as many Republicans as Democrats in proportion to the numbers of each, who asked me to allow the bill to be passed over until the next session of Congress. I said to them that I was in favor of passing the bill at this session, and I wanted the Committee on Rules to give me a rule, and that if my Committee on Immigration were reached on any Calendar Wednesday I would be there, as I have been here every Calendar Wednesday and stayed through until the gavel fell at the end of the day, for the purpose of trying to get that bill and place it upon its passage.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Upon whom does the responsibility rest, if it may be termed responsibility, for failure to pass the Burnett bill during this session?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I think that the responsibility rests just where it did two years ago, when there was a similar

failure, when the Republican Party was in power—upon the Rules Committee. We could not get a rule for its consideration.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Then the only difference is that at this time the responsibility is upon the Democratic Committee on Rules and that before it was upon the Republican Committee on Rules.

Mr. BURNETT. That is the way I look at it; yes. I am not defending the Committee on Rules, and I have not done so. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me read you along here again. The gentleman goes on and says—

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; if I can get more time.

Mr. RAKER. I do not want to inject any outside matter at this time, but I do wish to ask a question of the chairman of the committee at this time. I have been industrious and diligent in appearing before his committee, I have appeared most every time they met, and particularly before the subcommittee, upon a bill (H. R. 13500) having for its purpose the exclusion of all Asiatic laborers. That bill went to the immigration commissioner, and was reported back favorably with the exception, which stated that the general exclusion was a question of policy for the Government, but the administrative features of the bill were perfect. Now, I want to ask, if I am entitled to ask, upon whom does the responsibility rest that the subcommittee having in charge my bill, with whom I have so persistently worked that I almost became a bore to the committee, for its failure to report to the full committee or to the Congress upon that bill.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question of the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, there was a subcommittee—

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the bill or the committee to which the gentleman refers. I do not know who the subcommittee were, but I believe by the rules of this House a Member is prohibited from stating what happens in a committee.

The SPEAKER. There is certainly no doubt about that.

Mr. RAKER. Do I understand from that that I am not entitled to the information? If that is the case, of course I will not insist on an answer.

The SPEAKER. That is undoubtedly the rule.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, that being the rule I am not going to ask to violate any rule of this House when I can avoid it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I will not undertake to shift any responsibility upon any member of a subcommittee or anyone else. I suppose it is permissible for me to state my views in regard to the matter without any reflection whatever on my part toward other gentlemen. The bill of which the gentleman speaks would exclude all Asiatics. We have a treaty that was made, I believe, in 1907 by which the Japanese are almost entirely being excluded. The records of the Commissioner General of Immigration show that within the last two years' time only about 2,000 Japanese have come in each year and more than 5,000 have gone out. That being true, I stated to the committee that I believed that at this time it would be better, unless that condition was acute or grew to be acute, when 3,000 had gone out in the last two years more than had come in, that it certainly was not an acute condition as far as they were concerned, and as we already had a Chinese-exclusion act which kept Chinese out, and the educational test would keep out a great many of the 2,000 coming in—I mean coming in lawfully; I am not talking about those smuggled over the border, because that is illegal, and it is not within the provision of the law as it stands now to permit them to come in—and hence I believe it would be better to postpone that legislation for a year or two, unless conditions were more acute, as far as the Japs were concerned.

Now, I want to read further from the gentleman's speech. He complains and uses harsh epithets, to which I should reply but for the fact that I have too much respect for gentlemen in this House and the rules of this House to violate the rules of the House by replying in terms as I would have done, perhaps, if it were not for those rules.

The SPEAKER. Well, it has been agreed that all these harsh epithets shall be stricken out of the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to read what the gentleman said in criticism of Mr. POU, of the Rules Committee. He said:

But I want to remind such gentlemen, and particularly the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], who is now on the Rules Committee, that his committee and the Immigration Committee are absolutely responsible for the failure of this House to consider immigration legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I carry no brief in defense of the Rules Committee, or any other committee than my own, but any charge or insinuation that the Committee on Immigration has

tried to stifle this legislation or prevent the passage of this legislation is untrue and unjustifiable and not based upon the facts. Mr. Speaker, when you go into a court of equity you ought to go in with clean hands. Why could not the gentleman have taken advantage of a Wednesday when he could have had an hour in which to have made the speech from which I have quoted.

When the bill to keep out deserting alien seamen was called, I asked that it be passed for the present. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asked for what reason. I said because it was thought that there may be serious conflict between it and the bill that was reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and passed the House, in regard to imprisonment of seamen, and we wanted to look into that. We have secured an amendment. It is a close question, Mr. Speaker, and must be carefully considered and carefully revised, and not amateurishly revised, and we have been considering it, and believe we have reached what will be an amendment that will not be in conflict with that wise bill. And I would be glad to call it up if I could call that up and get it passed. Mr. MANN said the reason was proper.

The gentleman could have had his hour on that Wednesday if he had desired it, but he has slipped into the Record a charge that I and the committee over which I preside are responsible for the defeat of this legislation. I believe that his bill repeals the Chinese-exclusion act, and I want to call attention to that section of the bill. The last section of his bill does that. It is section 39:

SEC. 39. That this act shall take effect and be enforced from and after July 1, 1912. The act of March 26, 1910, amending the act of February 20, 1907, to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; the act of February 20, 1907, to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States, except section 34 thereof; the act of March 3, 1903, to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States, except section 34 thereof—

Here comes what is a repeal of the Chinese exclusion law—

all laws relating to the exclusion of Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent, except such provisions thereof as may relate to the naturalization of aliens; and all other acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed on and after the taking effect of this act.

He says the provision in section 3 of his bill saves him from the criticism that I have made to it. Let us see if it does. It is the long section. It says:

SEC. 3. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, and insane persons.

And so forth.

A semicolon appears after all those classes. Going over on the next page, he says:

All male aliens 16 years of age or over, who are physically capable of reading and writing, but who are unable to read and write in some language or dialect, such aliens to be tested in this regard in accordance with methods and rules to be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, but an admissible alien may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, or a son not over 18 years of age, otherwise admissible, whether said father or grandfather or son are able to read and write or not.

Those are the excepted classes. Then comes a full stop—a period—and then there is a provision:

This provision, however, shall not apply to citizens of Canada, Newfoundland, Cuba, the Bermudas, or Mexico, nor to alien residents of continental United States returning from foreign contiguous territory after a temporary sojourn therein, nor to aliens in continuous transit through the United States, nor to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, Guam, Porto Rico, or Hawaii except as hereinafter provided, nor to aliens arriving in the Philippine Islands, Guam, Porto Rico, or Hawaii, but if any such alien, not having become a citizen of the United States, shall later arrive at any port or place of the United States on the North American Continent, the reading and writing requirement shall apply.

Those are the exceptions to it. Now he comes in after a semicolon, after a full stop before it, with—persons who are not eligible to become citizens of the United States by naturalization.

I would like to see any court give any other construction to this law that must be strictly construed. I would like to see an enunciation of those who should be kept out. It comes to a full stop, and then comes a semicolon, and says:

Aliens who are not citizens of the United States.

No court would say that that, disconnected as it is, has any reference to the fact that persons who are not eligible to become citizens of the United States by naturalization are excluded. Now, you take that, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the specific repeal of the Chinese-exclusion law, and in the last section of this the exclusion law is repealed. The gentleman can not escape the proposition.

[The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] having expired, by unanimous consent he was granted 15 minutes additional.]

Mr. BURNETT. In my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I criticized the gentleman for this:

And if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor that any alien so brought to the United States was so affected or afflicted at the time of foreign embarkation, and that the existence of such mental or physical defect or inability to read and write might have been detected by means of a competent medical examination at such time, such person shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of \$200 for each and every violation of this provision.

They have to have a mental examination to determine whether they can read and write. What do you think of that?

But the gentleman pleads the baby act by saying the printers interlarded that expression, and says he has something in the bill that makes it clear. If that be true, the gentleman could have made that change there and reintroduced this bill and put it on the calendar, and not subjected himself to the criticism ever since January 19. He boasts how long it has been here; and certainly the gentleman has not read it since, until I called his attention to the fact that he was asking that people who were subjected to a physical examination to tell whether they could read or write or not.

Now, there is another thing that I want to call attention to. The gentleman's bill would admit those coming in from Canada, the Bermudas, Cuba, and Mexico—that is, he excepts those who are citizens of those countries. I suppose the gentleman did not take the time to examine into the fact that there are 18,000 or 19,000 Mexicans coming in every year, many of them being of the most vicious class of immigrants and over 40 per cent of them unable to read and write. Yet the gentleman would keep out those coming from Germany, and England, and Ireland, Scotland, and Scandinavia—any person coming from there—although there would be but few of them, and let in the Mexican.

In the speech of which the gentleman complains I show that not more than 1 per cent of those from the British Isles, and less than 1½ per cent of those from Scandinavian countries, and not more than 2 per cent of the Jewish people from Russia, and not more than 2 per cent of the Bohemians, Jews, and French would be excluded.

The gentleman is willing that it shall be applied to them, but here Mexico sends some of the most vicious people who ever cross our borders, and the gentleman wants to throw open the gates of our country and let these people come in here and make war against organized government. [Applause.]

This is the bill of the gentleman. And not only that, but I do not suppose the gentleman knew the fact that Mexico allows the naturalization of the Chinese, and how easy, then, it would be for them to effect an entrance here! The gentleman rises in indignation against the imputation that his bill would let in the Chinese, and yet the laws of Mexico are such that Chinese may be naturalized there, and the gentleman by allowing the Chinese to come into Mexico and stay the requisite time for naturalization, would then allow them lawfully to come across our borders.

That is the gentleman's bill, Mr. Speaker. I do not care what attorney prepared it, I do not care whether it was the work of an expert or not. I deny that fact, because the members of the commission ought to have had some notice of the fact that such an enormity was attempted to be perpetrated upon them as this bill seeks to perpetrate. Those are the plain facts, and any lawyer who had ever looked into a law book ought to realize the danger of it and guard against it.

The framers of the Dillingham bill did realize the danger there, and there was inserted at the end of section 3, I believe, what is still an obscure statement of the fact that the Chinese are sought to be excluded from the operation of the provision applying to those who can come in at all. In other words, the repeal of the Chinese-exclusion law ought to be avoided.

Now, then, I am not here, Mr. Speaker, to defend the Senate. Those distinguished gentlemen who inserted in the Dillingham bill the exception that allows those to come in under the provisions of passports may be able to give their reason for doing that. As I said a moment ago, as far as the Japanese coming to this country are concerned, but few of them would be affected either way, and the illiteracy test, if that could be passed, which was left out in the committee of the Senate, would exclude, in my judgment, the greater part of them.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that about 90 per cent of the Japanese that enter the United States can read and write?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not think the records show that.

Mr. RAKER. That is my understanding.

Mr. BURNETT. The reports of the commissioner general will show what the fact is.

Mr. CANDLER. Does the gentleman mean that they can read and write English?

Mr. BURNETT. No. No; they are not required to read and write English.

Mr. RAKER. As I understand, the Dillingham bill does not require that they shall be able to read and write English, but just that they shall be able to read and write some language. Is not that right?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have covered the ground. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Focht] says that I never saw this in his bill until my attention was called to it by some attorney of a steamship company. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not care where I got my information. His statement is not true to start with, and I will elaborate that after a little. But I am not so stolid or so set that I will not take information from any source, if it is correct information. The fact is that the gentleman's bill was never referred to during the time of the discussion of the Dillingham bill. No attorney, no agent, no individual ever made any reference to it, except that Judge SABATH at one time, realizing that the gentleman was in the room—I did not notice his presence up to that time—asked him if he had anything to say in regard to his bill, and he did not ask to be heard.

I think the gentleman comes in with poor grace, when he has attacked me in the manner that he has, and then attacked the manner in which I replied to him. He is unjust and incorrect in his attack. I would brand it with different language, Mr. Speaker, but for my reverence and respect for the rules of this House. I have stated the case. If the gentleman can make anything out of that, he is at liberty to make as much as he cares to, but those are the stern and stubborn facts, and there his bill stands and there the result will stand. [Applause.] Without doubt his bill repeals the Chinese exclusion act.

I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, reported the Senate bill quite a while ago?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember the date.

Mr. BURNETT. I can give the gentleman the date. It was reported June 7.

Mr. MANN. And also reported his own bill, a House bill, on the same subject.

Mr. BURNETT. Prior to that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman states, and I accept any statement which he makes, that he has made every diligent effort to get the bills up for consideration.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman, then, thoroughly convinced that under the new reform rules of the House, which I see referred to nearly every day in some speech as having been reformed so that business can come before the House when gentlemen desire it to come—is the gentleman convinced that these reform rules have been so well reformed, when the chairman of an important committee of the House, with a very important bill in charge, is yet unable after the most diligent effort, extending over months, to get it before the House for consideration?

Mr. BURNETT. No; I think there ought to be some further reforms. [Applause.] I think what they have is a very great reform over what was the condition when the gentleman's party was in power.

Mr. MANN. In what respect, as to the immigration bill?

Mr. BURNETT. In regard to these Calendar Wednesdays, which came in perhaps by force of circumstances toward the end of the Republican control of this House, I believe it is wrong that one committee should have two days on Calendar Wednesday and then go on with indefinite debate afterwards. I believe there ought to be some reform there in regard to Calendar Wednesday, so that one committee should not occupy that day for two Wednesdays and then continue indefinite debate afterwards. I think that is one of the reforms that is still needed.

Mr. MANN. Under the old rules of the House, and, for that matter, under the existing rules, it is in order every day to call the calendar of committees; in fact, that is the regular order under the rule. Since the reform of Calendar Wednesday was instituted it is not very often that the Speaker can possibly get the opportunity of proceeding to a call of the calendar. That has not worked very effectively in getting the gentleman's bill before the House.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama a question?

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimously consent that the gentleman from Alabama may have two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. If this Calendar Wednesday rule were to be amended so as to allow only two hours' general debate on a separate bill, does not the gentleman think we then would have a true reform? I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that as the Calendar Wednesday rule was originally proposed to this House it provided that only three hours should be allowed in general debate on each bill and that I myself this year have introduced a resolution which is sleeping in the files of the Committee on Rules confining general debate on any bill brought up on any Calendar Wednesday to two hours.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Answering that question, I will say I believe there ought to be some amendment. As to whether the two-hour rule would be the correct one or not, I am not here to say, but I think there ought to be some limit to it.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that even on as great a bill as the immigration bill, which is not by any means the greatest bill that has ever come before the House the House ought to be restricted in general debate to two hours or that upon some great measure the House ought to be restricted by the rules to two hours' debate, when if it is on the House Calendar that is the end of all debate, because there is no five-minute debate on bills on the House Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I want to correct the gentleman in one thing. His resolution is not sleeping in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I ought not to have stated that.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I wish to say I am heartily in favor of the gentleman's resolution, and if there is any one reform that ought to be brought about in this House in regard to the rules it is the one limiting time for debating these bills on Calendar Wednesday, and I hope that both sides of the House, Republican and Democratic alike, will insist that debate be limited to two hours upon these bills on Calendar Wednesday, and then if very important matters come up upon that day, and more time be needed, we can always find a way to consider such a bill in some way.

Mr. MANN. How?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have suggested in that rule to which the gentleman referred that by a two-thirds vote of the House the time for general debate may be extended. I think that safeguards the opportunity for reasonable debate. The gentleman from Illinois asked the gentleman from Alabama whether he did not think two hours much too short a time in which to consider the immigration bill. I call both gentlemen's attention to the fact that only three hours were allowed on June 25, 1906, when the great fight came upon immigration. This time was allowed not for general debate alone but for reading and debating the 45 sections of the bill as well.

Mr. MANN. Did the gentleman approve it?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. MANN. And now the gentleman seeks to make it two hours.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. What I disapproved was the rule which made it impossible to get a yea-and-nay vote upon the amendments adopted.

Mr. MANN. There will be no yea-and-nay vote on amendments on a bill that is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The fact is that on Calendar Wednesday now under the rule a majority of the House can terminate debate at any time.

The SPEAKER. All of this debate is out of order.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, now that the time of the gentleman from Alabama has been extended, I desire to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Is it not a fact that under the rules of the House at the present time a majority of the House can close general debate or limit it to any time it desires on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. There has never been a time when a majority, if it wished to conceal its views on any particular question, could not do so by voting to consider something else. There is not a doubt that the Members of this House, by refusing to close debate, could conceal from their constituents the fact that they desired to avoid going on record on an awkward bill. That is what I object to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is not an answer to the question at all.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I want to make the closure of debate automatic unless extended by a two-thirds vote of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman wants an automatic rule limiting the time for debate on bills which under the rule now come up under special conditions, and, regardless of the merits or the conditions, he wants to have the most effective gag rule ever designed to force legislation through the House.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Possibly, under certain circumstances. Here we have been for the last few weeks on Calendar Wednesday trying to avoid the consideration of the immigration bill. Why? Not because a majority of the House is opposed to the bill, but because a majority does not want the bill to come up. Whichever way men vote, they fear they may get into trouble.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's purpose is to make it impossible to debate bills that Members wish to debate in order to make it possible to reach the bill which he insists a majority of the House is anxious to pass but does not want to consider.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Members of the House avoid going on record for or against a particular bill by voting to consider some other bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I think the gentleman exaggerates matters. All the Members of this House act about the same.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; I plead guilty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Neither the gentleman nor myself conduct ourselves any differently on these matters from other gentlemen.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. For administrative reasons our immigration restrictions are relaxed as to either Canada or Newfoundland. We know that it would be highly inconvenient and probably of no practical effect to enforce an illiteracy test on passengers who travel daily on the ferryboats in and out of Detroit, for instance. Hundreds of trains cross the Canadian border every day. I have never believed and I do not now believe that it is wise to impose an illiteracy test against Canadians. Nevertheless, I raise no objection to including Canada in the operation of the illiteracy test, if that will help to pass the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think if the gentleman wants a bill of that sort he ought not to let in the illiterates from Canada, so as to continue the distressful and horrifying conditions in the New England mills we have been hearing so much about.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Canada sends us practically no illiterates.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. There has been more or less said this morning in reference to a limitation of time of debate on Calendar Wednesday. Of course, you might as well limit it on every other day if you limit it on Calendar Wednesday, because you can call up on Calendar Wednesday any bill that is on the calendar which is not a revenue bill or an appropriation bill, practically speaking.

Here is a serious proposition urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] apparently acquiesced in by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Rules, that there ought to be in the rules a limitation of debate upon great measures. The gentleman from Massachusetts himself just now is a living illustration of his opposition to closing debate when attacked in the last speech. He would not be willing to have two hours' only general debate upon the immigration bill if he could not have part of the time and somebody should attack his propositions on immigration. I have often noticed in the House that when gentlemen become thoroughly infatuated with some particular bill that they would like to close general debate until that bill is passed if they can control the time that is allowed on general debate on the bill. But I believe that the rules ought always to provide that a small minority of the House on great public questions should have the opportunity of being heard in general debate. The rules now authorize a majority of the House to close debate at once upon a House calendar bill by operation of the previous question, and whenever they please upon a Union Calendar bill by a vote of the House. Here we have had up this year or have on the calendar a bill for Philippine independence, a bill providing for a general government in the Philippine Islands, the immigration bill, and we will have the compensation bill, which is not yet on the calendar, although it ought to be, and a serious proposition being urged that the House shall limit debate by the rules for two hours, subject, of course, I believe, to two-thirds of the House giving a larger time, but absolutely foreclosing the right of a small minority to have any time in general debate. We have seen how that operates when we come to debate upon a question. The chairman of the committee or the gentleman in charge of a bill is entitled to the first hour. Nominally, somebody in opposition to the bill is entitled to the next hour. As a matter of fact, a member of the minority of the committee is recognized for the second hour; and if one member of it will state that he is opposed to the bill at all he is entitled to the hour under the practice of the House, and no outside Member is entitled to any time if the time is to be cut so short.

I do not believe in a reform of the rules which provides that the consideration of measures must take place in the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol and can not take place in the House of Representatives. [Applause.] If there is any one thing that has largely destroyed the influence of the House of Representatives in the popular mind it is the fact that we pass bills of great public importance often with little or no debate, and then they go to the Senate, where they are often thoroughly debated, and generally in that respect changed entirely, and come back to the House, where we either send them to conference, and then have no debate upon the measures at all in the House, or agree to the Senate amendments with very little debate. There are many ways now of limiting debate. There are many ways of extending debate. Gentlemen may make rules from now until the end of time, and there never will be found a method of preventing delay where a majority of the House body desire delay. You may shut off general debate. You may do what you please in reference to that, but you will not expedite the consideration of measures to which a majority of the body is opposed in this or any other legislative body. I protest against the proposition that the House shall adopt a rule which will prevent proper consideration of great public measures.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I just came into the Chamber and directly or indirectly the subject of immigration seems to be talked about. It has been a good deal talked about in the last few years. I have very pronounced views upon it, and I have no desire to conceal them. I have no desire to avoid responsibility for any action as a Member of this House that I have ever taken heretofore or now.

There are about 350,000,000 people of our race—the Caucasian race—engaged in one occupation and another in Europe. My forebears, scattered around in various countries, finally landed in this country a little over a century ago. I am glad they came. I do not know whether they could read and write or not. Whatever this generation that I belong to of my family may amount to, for two generations at least they were people who lived in the sweat of their faces. They were Caucasians; they were good citizens; they contributed to the development and the betterment of our civilization.

Now, we have got less than 100,000,000 of people in the United States. When we are as thickly settled as Europe is, we will have from 400,000,000 to 500,000,000. Thus far we have just scratched the surface of this country. There come to this

country about a million immigrants a year, those who are permitted to come. I have voted for Chinese exclusion because, with the habits of the Chinese and the manner of their living, we can not sustain our civilization and compete with them.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky). Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I would rather not, because I have only five minutes. I do not want to talk long.

Now, about a million, as I say, on the average, come every year, people of substantially our race, people who are willing to live in the sweat of their faces. I would rather have, if need be, a thousand or ten thousand men come that can not read and write who are willing to work and help matter assume shape that is useful to the human family, than to have a hundred come that can read and write and who seek to live by "black-hand" operations or otherwise in the sweat of somebody else's faces; and therefore I protest against that illiteracy qualification.

I can tell you how you can stop immigration to this country. You can do it by enacting laws that will cover all of the nearly 100,000,000 people in this country—laws that in their operation will decrease the wage or the compensation of the people, however employed, in the United States. This million a year comes—what for? For a better wage, for a better manner of living, for a better civilization; and the common schools take care of their children. The first generation, in the main, that works is pretty good, and the second generation is better, because they learn the language and learn our habits.

Now, if you will pursue the policy that will make it unprofitable for them to come they will not come. Now, as I am a little over a century old in this country—a little over, about a century and 12 years—I have no sympathy with the men who come in this generation from Europe, and in the second generation or any other generation will say, "We will pursue a policy that will stop immigration, because we want to get rid of that competition here. When you pursue that policy, you come into competition with 350,000,000 people, substantially of the Caucasian race. I would rather have a million a year, who labor in Europe and ship their products to this country, come as your forbears and my forbears came, and cast in their lot with us, shutting out the criminal, shutting out the dissolute, shutting out the diseased; I would rather have them come and help the coming generations to develop this country with liberty, and, as we increase in population, and as the hives swarms and goes out to other portions of North and South America, to work out their salvation; I would rather have them come than reduce our style of living and reduce our standard of compensation to the level of that of the Old World. Choose ye as your judgment warrants.

This is not a new doctrine for me. I have been attacked bitterly touching immigration. I have nothing to conceal. I have nobody to call hard names, but I do not see legislation as proper that other gentlemen do see. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, in connection with quite a number of Members of the House, I got permission to extend my remarks, but I find no mention of it in the RECORD. May I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the gentleman will be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DYER was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CERTAIN REAL ESTATE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House bill 15626, to provide for the proper deed of conveyance to real estate in the District of Columbia when the United States contributes to its purchase or condemnation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAKER). This does not require unanimous consent, does it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; this is District of Columbia day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, let us have the bill reported.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter whenever any real estate is acquired, whether by purchase or condemnation, to be used, in whole or in part, by the municipal government of the District of Columbia, or

any branch or department thereof, and the United States contributes to the purchase price thereof, the deed of conveyance therefor shall be made to the District of Columbia and the United States jointly, in the same proportion to which each has contributed toward its purchase or condemnation.

Sec. 2. That this act shall take effect upon its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have the bill reported.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It has been read.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk read the original bill, but there is a committee amendment, and the bill is not reported until the committee amendment is reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That whenever any real estate heretofore or hereafter acquired by the District of Columbia toward the purchase price of which the United States contributed, ceases to be used for the principal purpose for which it was acquired it shall be sold; and, when sold, the proceeds of sale shall be divided between the United States and the District of Columbia in the same proportion as each contributed to the purchase and improvement of same. Any improvements put upon any such real estate, as well as any fixtures or appurtenances thereunto belonging, shall be sold with the real estate, and the proceeds of sale shall be disposed of in exactly the same manner as the proceeds of sale of the real estate as above set out. The provisions of this act shall also apply to and include any property acquired as aforesaid, whether it be within or out of the said District of Columbia.

"The sale of said real property shall be made at public auction, in front of the Municipal Building, after having been advertised four times in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia, one week to intervene between each publication, the last publication to be made on the day before the sale, the sale to begin at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes in the afternoon; but the property shall not be knocked off or sold until 4 o'clock; that is, the sale is to be cried for 30 minutes. The property so sold shall be paid for as follows: One-third cash and the remainder in equal installments due 6 and 12 months after day of sale, the deferred payments to bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from day of sale until paid, a lien to be reserved upon the property to secure the deferred payments. Other than the newspaper advertising, the expenses of the sale and conveyance to the purchaser shall not exceed \$50.

"The deferred payments herein mentioned shall be evidenced by promissory notes, the total amount of which shall be divided between and executed to the United States and the District of Columbia according to the interest of each therein. The Secretary of the Treasury shall require such surety, in addition to the lien, upon the notes payable to the United States as he shall deem ample and sufficient; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall in like manner pass upon the sufficiency of the surety upon the notes payable to the District of Columbia. The purchaser may, upon his election to do so, pay cash instead of executing the promissory notes, or he may take up any of the deferred payments before maturity.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall make the settlement of such accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia, and this settlement made by him shall be final."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to the fact that this is a very extraordinary bill. It gives unusual powers to an official. Under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury could sell most of the parks in the District of Columbia to whose purchase the United States has contributed if he were to determine that they were no longer required for park purposes. I do not think at this time in the session a bill like this should be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman from New York is entirely mistaken in saying that any executive officer should dispose of the parts under this bill. The gentleman says this is a most extraordinary bill; it is, because it is a most unusual bill. The United States for years and years has contributed to the purchase of real estate in the District of Columbia, to be used exclusively by the District of Columbia. The school property now in the District amounts to about \$10,000,000. There is other property to the extent of perhaps more than \$5,000,000, to the purchase of all of which the United States Government has contributed to the extent of one-half. Now, it would certainly seem that no man could offer a reasonable objection to the proposition that when this property ceases to be used for the purpose for which it was required it may be sold and the money be distributed between the United States Government and the District of Columbia in the same proportion in which it was contributed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It might be most desirable to use the property for some other purpose. For instance, property may be used for a school for a good many years, and the school be abandoned, and then it might be highly desirable to erect a police station or an engine house upon the land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And Congress would have a perfect right to have that done.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the Secretary of the Treasury could sell it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But for the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to get money from the Federal Government upon one guise and then use it in their discretion, without the interference of Congress, for another purpose, is wrong, and I say that somebody in Congress representing the interests of the United States Government in these matters should have the right to interpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can prevent that practice by reporting a bill which will prohibit property acquired for one purpose from being used for any other purpose unless Congress specifically authorizes it. But to place in any one individual officer the power—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This bill does not do that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is how I caught the reading of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman from New York caught it wrong.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then there is all the more reason why it should not be passed at this particular time under these circumstances.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. In the event this property in which the United States has an equal or certain proportion with the District of Columbia ceases to be used for the purpose originally intended, is it the purpose of the gentleman's bill to sell the property at auction?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; and divide the money between the two interests purchasing.

Mr. BATHRICK. In the proportion in which they were originally interested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky to yield long enough for me to ask unanimous consent to have laid before the House a bill which just came over from the Senate, in order that it may be considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Would that interfere with the further consideration of this matter at this time?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Stuart, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7500. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes," approved July 22, 1912.

OKANOGAN, WASH.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the bill (S. 7500) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes," approved July 22, 1912.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAKER). The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation, in the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes," approved July 22, 1912, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out in the first section thereof, in the description of the lands authorized to be sold, the word "twenty-three," after the word "township," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty-three."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, before consent is given, I desire to explain to the House what it is. Recently the House passed a bill authorizing the sale of certain lands to the town of Okanogan for public-park purposes. When the bill was introduced the Department of the Interior recommended an amendment, giving the description of the property, and in that description it reads "section 17, township 23 north." It was put in the bill in that way and it is now discovered that it should be township 33 instead of 23.

Mr. GARRETT. This is a Senate bill?

Mr. MANN. Yes; and this is to correct it by making it read township 33 instead of 23.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The description is to make it apply to the property in question?

Mr. MANN. To the property in question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

CERTAIN REAL ESTATE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15626) to provide for the proper deed of conveyance in real estate in the District of Columbia when the United States contributes to its purchase or condemnation.

The question was taken.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 3.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts (during the counting). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I renew it. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House is not in session. I make the point of order that the House is not in session. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I object, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 15626 be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been reported.

The SPEAKER. Are there any amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The amendment also has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for one hour.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman if he desires to do so can make the point.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I desire merely to speak for five minutes on the subject which has been discussed here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that at the end of five minutes the House take a recess for one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that at the end of five minutes the House take a recess for one hour.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I withdraw my point.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one request?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I will.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on H. R. 25738, H. R. 19344, and a bill which has just passed the Senate, S. 5068.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, and Mr. BUCHANAN were granted leave to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested and amused at the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] on the subject of immigration. He recited that there are 350,000,000 people of the Caucasian race in Europe who would be competing with American labor except for the tariff wall between us; that we have in this country approximately 100,000,000 of people; that he is opposed to any reduction of the tariff, or any considerable reduction of the tariff, but desires conditions maintained better in this country than they are in Europe through the protective tariff.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, I never mentioned the protective tariff. If the gentleman desires to put words in my mouth in regard to my statement, well and good; but I will say to him now, I am in favor of the Republican policy of protection, and high enough to protect.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I understand the gentleman's views, but his argument is the same as to say that if you have two watering troughs by the side of each other, connected by a tube at the bottom, that you can fill one of them full of water and the water will not run into the other. So long as the people from Europe can come to the United States without restriction and conditions are better in this country, they will come, and there is no way by which conditions of labor can be kept to a higher standard here in the future than in European countries without restriction upon European immigration. If you are going to have unrestricted immigration from European countries in this manner, you can not by artificial methods, by a protective tariff or otherwise, maintain better conditions for labor in the United States than anywhere else—

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me? I am not in favor of unrestricted immigration, but the name of the gentleman harks back to the same country to which I hark back—that is, Ireland. I do not know how old the gentleman's forbears are in this country, but the Irish seem to be able to get to Congress within a generation, and I am not surprised—

Mr. NORRIS. They go on the police force in the first generation and get into Congress in the second generation.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I have not said I was in favor of any additional restrictions upon immigration, but I have said that I was amused at the gentleman's argument. It is an absolutely impossible and an illogical one—

Mr. CANNON. Thank you.

Mr. LAFFERTY (continuing). To say that you can keep labor conditions in this country better than they are in foreign countries and permit foreigners to come in practically without restriction.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me? A million of them do come. Three hundred and fifty million of them, with cheap transportation, send their products without a protective policy. Is one million greater than three hundred and fifty million?

Mr. LAFFERTY. I am in favor of maintaining better conditions in the United States than any foreign countries if possible to do so, and I favor a reasonable protective tariff upon competitive articles. I also favor more rigid exclusion laws for the same reason.

I now yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] if he is here.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. The gentleman evidently is not here. Yield it to me.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I will.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, when the sundry civil bill was up, I presented some statements in reference to the Department of Justice. I would like the privilege of extending my remarks in the Record so as to present a brief summary of the work of the Committee on Expenditures in that department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. In connection with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL] I ask also that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING], my colleague, have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LARCENY IN INTERSTATE SHIPMENTS.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider in the House as in Committee of the Whole the bill H. R. 16450, reported from the Judiciary Committee unanimously, which is a bill to prevent larceny.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill to which he refers. The time has come under the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for a recess for one hour.

Mr. CARLIN. I ask unanimous consent that the House postpone that for one minute. This bill will not take longer than that.

Mr. MANN. It will take more than that. You can call it up after we meet again.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can proceed after the recess.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may call it up after the recess.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will grant it, if the deficiency bill is not here, without any motion about it now.

Mr. MANN. That is, by asking unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. By asking unanimous consent.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 3.25 p. m. by the Speaker.

By unanimous consent, Mr. McCoy and Mr. Davis of West Virginia were granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

LARCENY IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider in the House as in the Committee of the Whole the bill H. R. 16450.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 16450. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let us hear the bill reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16450) to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles therefrom in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious exportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same.

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall unlawfully break the seal of any railroad car containing interstate or foreign shipments of freight or express, or shall enter any such car with intent, in either case, to commit larceny therein; or whoever shall steal or unlawfully take, carry away, or conceal, or by fraud or deception obtain from any railroad car, station house, platform, depot, steamboat, barge, or wharf, with intent to convert to his own use any goods or chattels moving as, or which are a part of or which constitute, an interstate or foreign shipment of freight or express, or shall buy, or receive, or have in his possession any such goods or chattels, knowing the same to have been stolen; or whoever shall steal or shall unlawfully take, carry away, or by fraud or deception obtain, with intent to convert to his own use, any baggage which shall have come into the possession of any railroad company or other common carrier for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or shall break into, steal, take, carry away, or conceal any of the contents of such baggage, or shall buy, receive, or have in his possession any such baggage or any article therefrom of whatsoever nature, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall in each case be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both, and prosecutions therefor may be instituted in any district wherein the crime shall have been committed. The carrying or transporting of any such freight, express, baggage, goods, or chattels from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall constitute a separate offense and subject the offender to the penalties above described for unlawful taking, and prosecutions therefor may be instituted in any district into which such freight, express, baggage, goods, or chattels shall have been removed or into which they shall have been brought by such offender.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the amendments reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "barge" and insert the word "vessel" in lieu thereof.
Amend, page 2, lines 11 and 12, by striking out the words "railroad company or other."

On page 3, insert, after line 8, the following new section:
"SEC. 2. That nothing in this act shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof; and a judgment of conviction or acquittal under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution hereunder for the same act or acts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the proponent of the bill a question.

Mr. CARLIN. With pleasure, sir.

Mr. LAFFERTY. This bill fixes the punishment, as I understand from the reading, at not more than 10 years in the penitentiary or not more than \$5,000 fine. Does the bill fix the full amount of stolen goods?

Mr. CARLIN. No.

Mr. LAFFERTY. There is no minimum fixed?

Mr. CARLIN. No minimum. Therefore it leaves the minimum to be as small as possible for the penalty. The penalty for a small offense could be made a day in jail, or not a day in jail, or a dollar fine. It leaves that discretionary.

Mr. LAFFERTY. What is the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. CARLIN. Well, it grows out of this fact, that if a train be in transit, passing from one State to another, and a larceny be committed, the prosecution can not be successfully had in the State unless you can fix the jurisdictional point. For instance, along the line between Virginia and North Carolina, in the case of a train passing between two States, if a larceny were committed on a moving train it is impossible to have a conviction.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Well, Mr. Speaker, several States have already passed laws, as I understand it—

Mr. CARLIN. The gentleman is mistaken—

Mr. LAFFERTY. Providing that an offense committed on a railroad train may be prosecuted in any county in the State; and to pass a law now which would permit the defendant or

the accused to be taken from one State to another State, or even across an intervening State would possibly work an injustice.

Mr. CARLIN. This law remedies that, and allows the State courts to take jurisdiction.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Curtiss, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

House concurrent resolution 65.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on the 25th day of August, 1912, at 3 o'clock a. m.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 63.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 25,000 copies of the majority and minority reports of the committee authorized under House resolution 148, to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890 and other acts, be printed for the use of the House, 15,000 to be distributed through the folding room and 10,000 through the document room.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. J. Res. 138. To pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States a sum equal to one-twelfth of their annual salaries in lieu of transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. MANN. There was applause on the floor on the other resolution. There ought to be applause in the galleries on this.

HOUR OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution relating to adjournment may be laid before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a concurrent resolution in reference to the final adjournment, with Senate amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 65.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on the 25th day of August, 1912, at 3 o'clock a. m.

With the following amendments:

Line 5, strike out "twenty-fifth" and insert "twenty-sixth."
Lines 5 and 6, strike out "3 o'clock a. m." and insert "4.30 o'clock p. m."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Senate amendments to the resolution to adjourn be concurred in. I move to agree to the Senate amendments on the resolution to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the adjournment resolution. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the motion to concur in the Senate amendments was agreed to.

LARCENY IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. CARLIN. Now I will answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY]. I will say for the gentleman's information that this bill does not extend the jurisdiction from one State to another, but limits the jurisdiction within the district in which the offense is committed; that is, the district within the State. It simply extends it to the counties, but not to the States.

Mr. LAFFERTY. That is, the Federal courts?

Mr. CARLIN. Yes; the Federal courts.

Mr. LAFFERTY. But it would not allow the Federal court in Illinois to try an offense committed in Missouri?

Mr. CARLIN. Yes; and it does not allow an offense committed in the western district of a State to be tried in the eastern district of the same State.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I understand.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that there is no further objection to the bill, and I ask that it now be passed. I ask that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. It is a House Calendar bill and does not require that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the text.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. CARLIN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ONE MONTH'S COMPENSATION—EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE AND SENATE.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood that the Senate had sent, together with the resolution to adjourn, an additional resolution, which provides for the payment of an additional month's pay to the employees of the House and the Senate. I ask that that resolution be taken up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that request for the present. I understand there is something under consideration with reference to it, which I did not know of when I made the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

EXCHANGE OF SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, there is a Senate bill (S. 5068) on the Speaker's table. The House Committee on the Public Lands has made a unanimous report upon a similar bill. I ask unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and that it be passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill referred to by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read the bill (S. 5068) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands for school sections within an Indian, military, national forest, or other reservation, and for other purposes, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to make exchange of lands with the several States for those portions of the lands granted in aid of common schools, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, which lie within the exterior limits of any Indian, military, national forest, or other reservation, the said exchange to be made in the manner and form and subject to the limitations and conditions of sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stats., 796), and any such exchange whether heretofore or hereafter approved shall restore full title in the United States to the base land, without formal conveyance thereof by the State: *Provided*, That upon completion of the exchange the lands relinquished, reconveyed, or assigned as base lands shall immediately become a part of the reservation within which they are situated, and in case the same shall be found within the exterior limits of more than one reservation they shall become a part of that reservation which was first established: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the approval of selections embracing lands withdrawn as mineral under the act of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases" (36 U. S. Stat. L., pp. 847-848), until such lands have been found to be nonmineral and for that reason restored, but nothing herein contained shall prevent a limited approval, when the lands are within only a coal withdrawal, excluding from the approval coal deposits: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the State of Idaho.*

Mr. BATHRICK. Reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill permitting the State of California to adjust its rights. The Committee on the Public Lands have unanimously reported a similar bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. Is this a Senate bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Has a similar bill passed the House?

The SPEAKER. A similar bill has been reported favorably by the House committee.

Mr. COOPER. Has an identical bill been reported by the House committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not tell.

Mr. RAKER. An identical bill is on the calendar, reported from the House committee with a favorable report.

Mr. COOPER. Is the bill identical?

Mr. RAKER. Identical, with one little amendment as to the discretion of the Secretary, and we saw the Secretary, and that amendment is satisfactory to him.

The SPEAKER. This bill must be considered in Committee of the Whole, anyway.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. RAKER. I hope the gentleman from New York will not object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is a time when legislation ought to be watched.

Mr. WILLIS. Is not this the bill to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objected the other day?

Mr. RAKER. When the House bill was on the Unanimous Consent Calendar the gentleman from Illinois objected and it went off the calendar. This bill has passed the Senate, and a similar bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on the Public Lands. The matter has been gone into fully and thoroughly by the Public Lands Committee of the House. The bill is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, the Attorney General of the United States, as well as the State attorney of California and the surveyor general.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of any land-exchange bill at the tail end of this session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

SUITS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 23186) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 28 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 28. That any suit of a civil nature, at law or in equity, arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or treaties made or which shall be made under their authority, of which the district courts of the United States are given original jurisdiction by this title which may now be pending or which may hereafter be brought in any State court may be removed by the defendant or defendants therein to the district court of the United States for the proper district. Any other suit of a civil nature at law or in equity of which the district courts of the United States are given jurisdiction by this title and which are now pending or which may hereafter be brought in any State court may be removed into the district court of the United States for the proper district by the defendant or defendants therein being nonresidents of that State. And when, in any suit mentioned in this section, there shall be a controversy which is wholly between citizens of different States and which can be fully determined as between them, then either one or more of the defendants actually interested in such controversy may remove said suit into the district court of the United States for the proper district. And where a suit is now pending or may hereafter be brought in any State court in which there is a controversy between a citizen of the State in which the suit is brought and a citizen of another State, any defendant being such citizen of another State may remove such suit into the district court of the United States for the proper district, at any time before the trial thereof, when it shall be made to appear to said district court that from prejudice or local influence he will not be able to obtain justice in such State court or in any other State court to which the said defendant may under the laws of the State have the right on account of such prejudice or local influence to remove said cause: *Provided*, That if it further appear that said suit can be fully and justly determined as to the other defendants in the State court without being affected by such prejudice or local influence and that no party to the suit will be prejudiced by a separation of the parties, said district court may direct the suit to be remanded so far as relates to such other defendants to the State court to be proceeded with therein. At any time before the trial of any suit which is now pending in any district court or may hereafter be entered therein and which has been removed to said court from a State court on the affidavit of any party plaintiff that he had reason to believe and did believe that from prejudice or local influence he was unable to obtain justice in said State court the district court shall, on application of the other party, examine into the truth of said affidavit and the grounds thereof, and unless it shall appear to the satisfaction of said court that said party will not be able to obtain justice in said State court it shall cause the same to be remanded thereto. Whenever any cause shall be removed from any State court into any district court of the United States, and the district court shall decide that the cause was improperly removed and order the same to be remanded to the State court from whence it came, such remand shall be immediately carried into execution, and no appeal or writ of error from the decision of the district court so remanding such cause shall be allowed: *Provided further*, That no case arising under an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908, or any amendment thereto, and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court of the United States: *Provided further*, That no suit against a corporation or joint stock company brought in a State court of the State in which the cause of action arose shall be removed to any court of the United States on the ground that the parties are citizens of different States if the suit is brought in the county where the cause of action arose or within the county where the defendant is served with process and the plaintiff resides."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he expects the House to consider and pass a bill of this complexity at this time in the session, after we have adopted a resolution for final adjournment?

Mr. GARRETT. I do not know what the House will do. I have made the request.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I can inform the gentleman that it will not consider that.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement in respect to it?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Curtiss, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had receded from its amendments

Nos. 22, 33, 34, and 114 to the bill (H. R. 25970) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 387):

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

In compliance with the foregoing resolution the President pro tempore appointed as said committee Mr. McCUMBER and Mr. MARTIN of Virginia.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON PRESIDENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed by the House to join a like committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses had concluded their business and are ready to adjourn report that they have performed the duty, and the President says he has no further communication to make.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

By unanimous consent, leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD was granted to Mr. CANDLER and to Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

ENTRIES ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1912, I addressed the House on the subject of entries on the public lands. In the course of my remarks I referred to the confidential reports made by special agents of the General Land Office. These reports are of the greatest importance to entrymen and are the subjects of the liveliest interest to all concerned in the settlement of the public lands and to all the public-land States.

Since the delivery of that speech the following order has been issued by the General Land Office, and I print the same with pleasure:

ORDER.

1. Where the record of a hearing on a special agent's adverse report is referred by "P" to another division for adjudication, the confidential file will be detached therefrom and placed in the "P" file.

2. Where a record is referred to another division for any action, and thereafter to be returned to "P," the confidential file will be detached and placed in file "P." "P" will retain docket card and place in "Pending elsewhere" file.

The confidential or secret reports referred to can not be seen by the entrymen or by any person or persons in their behalf. The above order means that hereafter no confidential report of a special agent is to be considered when any entry is being finally passed upon, and that hereafter no statement adverse to any entryman, to which the entryman has not been given opportunity to submit evidence in his own behalf, will be considered by the department in determining the merits of an entry.

Referring again to the subject of my remarks upon "Entries on the Public Lands," I am more confident than ever that entrymen should have the right of appeal to the courts from the decisions of the Department of the Interior upon their entries. I have a bill pending for this purpose, and investigation gives me reason to believe that this legislation will be enacted into law, and I earnestly hope that this will be done at a very early date. It is legislation greatly needed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Curtiss, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following joint resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate of the United States a sum equal to one-twelfth of their salaries in lieu of all transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress.

SUITS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], I will state that this is the exact legislation which passed this House during the last Congress as an amendment to the revision on the judiciary title. This legislation prevents the removal of causes brought in State courts against corporations chartered under the laws of other States to the Federal court upon the ground of diversity of citizenship of the corporation only. It is legislation with which I know, if the gentleman will refresh his memory, he is thoroughly familiar, because I know he and I have discussed it before. It is the exact legislation which passed this House at the last Congress as an amendment to the judiciary title, and is in the exact language in which it was finally agreed upon by the conferees.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have entire confidence, as has the whole membership of the House, in the word of my friend

from Tennessee, and yet I can not consent to the consideration of so important a measure at this time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to say this: It is reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will remember the legislation. The conferees on the revision bill fought over it here for two months and finally agreed upon it.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman think that a proposition which necessitated a discussion between conferees extending over a period of two or three months should be taken up by this House with the very small membership that is here and passed in 5 or 10 minutes?

Mr. GARRETT. Oh, Mr. Speaker, it was not the gist of the legislation that the conferees discussed, but the form in which it should be put. This House almost unanimously passed the legislation.

The language which I am using is the language which the conferees agreed upon. This is the effect of it: It will simply prevent the removal of causes from State courts to Federal courts that are brought by corporations on the ground of diversity of citizenship.

Mr. COOPER. It is a subject of very great importance, and the bill itself is one that I do not remember ever to have read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER. I object.

EXTRA MONTH'S PAY.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 138, providing for an extra month's pay for the House and Senate employees.

The SPEAKER. If there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, quite a number of Members of the House, on Saturday night, when the differences between the two Houses on the deficiency bill were before the House, inquired of me whether the amendment in the deficiency bill respecting the extra month's pay would be agreed to, and upon assurances that it would not be agreed to or that legislation of that character would not go through at this session of Congress, they left the city. Under the circumstances I shall have to object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire in a Democratic House to say anything to embarrass anyone, but suspension of the rules is in order, and I want to say, without embarrassment to anyone, that after two sessions of Congress—almost a year, or over, if you count it that way—it does seem that simple justice would warrant this, without regard to what caucus action may have been taken under different conditions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, of course, is very ingenious; but this resolution can not be passed under suspension of the rules at this time in the session. The employees of this House were appointed and accepted their positions with the knowledge that the compensation fixed by law was the compensation that would be paid them, and that there would be no extra compensation paid.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARLIN. Would it be in order to move to suspend the rules and put the resolution upon its passage?

Mr. MANN. Not unless the gentleman is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. CARLIN. I am asking that question of the Speaker for information.

The SPEAKER. It would not do a particle of good to ask to suspend the rules, and it would not do any good for the Chair to recognize the gentleman, because here is the rule about suspensions:

No rule shall be suspended except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present.

Of course the Chair will take official notice of the fact—

Mr. MANN. I hope the Chair will not make the announcement that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to embarrass the situation, but I am very anxious to have the resolution considered, and would like to ask leave to suspend the rules and put it on its passage.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman recognizes that suspension is wholly within the control of the Chair. No man can move to suspend the rules unless and until he is recognized by the Chair for that purpose.

Mr. CARLIN. I understand that. I am now asking to be recognized for the purpose of making the motion to suspend the rules and put the resolution upon its passage.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman withhold the motion for a moment?

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I was recognized, was I not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. But here is an amendment providing for 5 cents a mile each way—

The SPEAKER. That is not up for consideration at this particular time.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for recognition, and I had the floor ahead of everybody else.

Mr. MANN. And I was on my feet before the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CARLIN. I had never left the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois was up for some purpose, the Chair does not know what. [Laughter.]

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to give the House some information from the Committee on Appropriations concerning the appropriations made by Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, it is an evil day when the people are indifferent to the cost of their government. Such indifference begets prodigality, and the inevitable repentance results in burdens and inconveniences that are irksome to the country.

Thoughtful men have watched with alarm the rapid increase in the cost of government in the United States. This increase is not confined to the Federal Government, but it is apparent in the financial statements of every State and municipality.

The country has been passing through a wonderful period of prosperity. Manufactures have increased astonishingly, our fields have been yielding crops of extraordinary proportions, domestic trade has expanded to unanticipated dimensions, while the products of our farms and factories are displayed in every foreign mart and are utilized in the most remote and inaccessible places of our globe.

As recently pointed out by O. P. Austin, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor, since 1870 our foreign commerce has grown from less than \$1,000,000,000 to about \$4,000,000,000; our internal commerce from \$7,000,000,000 to \$33,000,000,000. The production of corn has increased from 1,000,000,000 to nearly 3,000,000,000 bushels; of wheat from 235,000,000 to 650,000,000 bushels; of cotton from 3,000,000 bales to 12,000,000 bales; the value of animals on farms from \$1,250,000,000 to over \$5,000,000,000; the value of farm products from \$2,000,000,000 to \$8,500,000,000; the gross value of manufactures produced from \$4,250,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000.

Our people have enjoyed opportunities for the acquisition of knowledge through improved school systems and increased facilities for travel and intercourse with other peoples never before offered in the world's history. They have had unparalleled prosperity and have been furnished with conveniences of modern life which have greatly improved the standard of living and encouraged an indifference to certain governmental matters, which can not always be ignored and must eventually be considered and remedied.

An awakening has been experienced during recent years. The unprecedented increase in the cost of living grossly disproportionate to the increased return for labor, the real measure of values, has resulted in an intelligent inquiry into conditions so unsatisfactory to most of our citizens.

Two causes above all others seem to be conceded as responsible for many of our present evils:

One, the unfair and unjust system of taxation by which an undue share of the income of those whose circumstances in life are not considered more than reasonably comfortable is taken through our customs laws for the support of our Government; the other, the difficulty or inability to readjust our system of taxation, and to remove many taxes from the necessities of life, so long as the Government is extravagantly conducted, or the instrumentalities provided for the conduct of the public service are either inefficient or are not utilized so as to render the most effective and comprehensive results.

The Democratic Party pledged itself, if intrusted with power, to do two things—to reduce tariff duties and to retrench public expenditures by the elimination of waste in administration and the abolition of useless, unnecessary, and inexcusable offices which hinder rather than advance efficiency in administration.

On August 22, 1911, just a year ago, I said on this floor:

This House is pledged to reform the administration of public affairs and to retrench public expenditures. No legitimate activity of the Government is to be curtailed, but not a dollar will be appropriated which a careful investigation does not demonstrate should be expended in a wise, efficient, and effective administration of public affairs.

In discharging their duties the Committee on Appropriations have proceeded on the principle thus enunciated. To use the very words of Mr. Garfield, uttered in this House on March 5, 1874:

They have attempted to ascertain what are the real and vital necessities of the Government; to find what amount of money will suffice to

meet all its honorable obligations, to carry on all its necessary and essential functions, to keep alive those public enterprises which the country desires its Government to undertake and accomplish.

It has been generally recognized that imperative reforms in the administration of the Federal Government must be effected. For several years efforts have been made to accomplish many admittedly needed improvements in the public service, which have merely emphasized the necessity for a thorough overhauling of the various services of the Government. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1911 discloses that in the estimates for the fiscal year 1912 a net total of 267 statutory positions in the offices of the Treasury in Washington had been eliminated and that for the present fiscal year—1913—it was proposed to drop 134 positions. That 141 positions had been eliminated in 1910, a total of 542 statutory places abolished since March 4, 1909, and the accompanying saving was accomplished without the separation of anyone from the public service. Deaths and resignations and a system of transfers have made possible the placing of those whose positions were abolished in other places in which vacancies occurred through normal causes.

In the field service during the same period 1,259 positions have been abolished, making a total reduction in the Treasury Department of 1,801.

Striking as these figures seem, demonstrating the contention that the public service has been shamefully overloaded with unnecessary employees, it was confirmed and emphasized by Maj. Gen. Wood, Chief of Staff of the Army. He assured this committee that his statement before the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department that the employees in the War Department in Washington were 25 per cent in excess of the number actually required was unquestionably correct. In his opinion the clerical force should be reduced 10 per cent a year until it reached a normal basis.

Conditions as imperatively requiring the attention of Congress undoubtedly exist in practically every executive department of the Government. From none of them, however, has any information, other than as mentioned herein, been furnished as a basis for action.

With the knowledge of the situation the work of improving the public service by improved methods, increased efficiency, and the elimination of unnecessary and useless employees and processes was begun.

This committee appreciated the force of the statement of President Taft in his message of January 17, 1912, that "Real economy is the result of efficient organization. By perfecting the organization the same benefits may be obtained at less expense. A reduction in the total of annual appropriations is not in itself a proof of economy, since it is often accompanied by a decrease in efficiency. The needs of the Nation may demand a large increase of expenditure, yet to keep the total appropriations within the expected revenue is necessary to the maintenance of public credit."

It was in this spirit that the important work of this committee was undertaken. Although the Executive and the Senate are politically hostile to the House, far-reaching reforms in public service have been initiated, while the House has reasserted more vigorously its constitutional prerogatives over the people's purse, and a successful move has been inaugurated to systematize and properly readjust the public service by which it will be immeasurably improved and hereafter conducted at much less expense.

REDUCTIONS MADE.

The estimates of appropriations for support of the Government submitted by the Executive to this session of Congress amount in all to \$1,040,648,026.55.

The appropriations made at this session of Congress amount to \$1,019,636,143.66.

The latter sum is a reduction of \$21,011,882.89 under the estimates and \$7,046,738.06 under the appropriations made at the last session of the last Congress, which body was controlled in both branches by the Republican Party.

Excluding the increase of \$12,500,000 made under the new law for pensions, the appropriations at this session show a reduction of \$19,546,738.06 under the appropriations of the last session of the last Congress and \$33,511,882.89 under the estimates approved and submitted by the Executive.

A further analysis of the history of appropriations at this session shows that the committees of the House charged with the preparation of the regular annual supply bills for the fiscal year 1913 reduced them \$40,868,434.54 under the estimates recommended to Congress.

The House in passing the bills reduced them \$40,135,284.54 under the regular annual estimates and \$49,161,361.66 under the appropriations of the previous session.

The Senate committees increased the bills as passed by the House to the extent of \$66,223,129.81, or \$26,087,845.27 in excess of the total estimates.

The Senate itself in passing the bills further increased them until their aggregate as passed by the House was exceeded by \$70,521,715.88 and the estimates by \$30,386,431.34.

The increases made by the Senate committees and by the Senate in acting on the bills after they left the House, it is proper to state, included \$12,500,000 for payment of pensions under legislation enacted after the House had passed the pension appropriation bill.

The final outcome in the conferences that reconciled the differences between the two Houses, or the increases by the Senate in the 13 regular annual appropriation bills, shows that, exclusive of the increase for pensions, the Senate yielded \$30,424,545.38 of the sums they proposed to add, and the House accepted only \$27,597,170.50.

The general deficiency act carries a total of only \$7,243,474.69, a sum, with one exception, considerably smaller than any similar act passed since 1886. The general deficiency and urgent deficiency acts appropriate a total of \$9,701,231.15, a reduction of \$9,498,768.85 under the estimates submitted and recommended by the Executive. Deficiency acts have provided in the past not only for deficiencies arising legitimately under the law, but have been made to carry large sums supplemental to the regular appropriations and rendered necessary through reckless and extravagant administration. The elimination of all such appropriations in the bill this session accounts in very large measure for the considerable reduction of \$9,498,768.85 in the deficiency estimates submitted and approved by the Executive.

The appropriations made during the session in miscellaneous acts, and additional to the sums carried in the regular annual appropriation acts, deficiency acts, and under permanent annual appropriations, amount approximately to \$3,250,000, which sum includes \$1,239,179.65 for the relief of sufferers from the floods of the Mississippi River, \$650,000 for emergency work in protecting the levees of that river, and \$300,000 for lifeboats and life-saving equipment for the transport service of the Army. The whole amount carried in these miscellaneous acts is \$1,573,306.81 less than was similarly appropriated at the last session and is more than \$20,000,000 less than was thus appropriated at the corresponding or long session of the last Congress.

The largest reduction made in any one of the annual supply bills is that made in the sundry civil bill; it is decreased from \$142,265,044.14 to \$112,039,184.40, or \$30,225,859.74 less than was appropriated by the act for last year.

The fortification act shows a greater proportionate decrease than any of the other service acts. It is reduced \$1,437,742 from a previous total of \$5,473,707, or more than 26 per cent.

The pension act is increased more than any other, namely, from \$153,682,000 to \$165,146,145.84. This considerable increase grows out of the act passed at this session materially increasing the rates of pension to those who served in the Civil War and in the War with Mexico.

USELESS PENSION AGENCIES ABOLISHED.

In connection with the pension act a notable accomplishment was wrought in the abolition of the 18 pension agencies for the payment of pensions with salaries of \$4,000 each. During Mr. Cleveland's last administration he sought, by Executive order under the authority still existing, to rid the Treasury of the burden of some of these useless and costly places by consolidating and reducing them from 18 to 9, but his Republican successor in office suspended the order before it could be placed in operation. Since that time many efforts have been made to abolish them outright, but without success, until the persistence of the House at this session was crowned with success. The annual saving that will follow the doing away with these sinecures, the consolidation of their 18 different clerical forces into one effective organization under the direction of the Pension Bureau in Washington, the elimination of rents and other needless expenses will speedily result in a saving of at least \$250,000 a year.

PENSION PAYMENTS EXPEDITED.

In addition an entirely new and modern system for the payment of pensions has been provided which will result in considerable saving to the pensioners and make more convenient the payment of the pension moneys.

Heretofore under the agency and voucher system within 15 days after the date the pension is due the pension agent prepared a voucher for every pensioner paid from the respective agencies. These vouchers were mailed to the pensioners. They had to be executed before notaries public and returned to the pension agent. Upon their receipt within a designated time the pension agent sent his check to the pensioner for the amount

due. Much of the work done in the various agencies scattered throughout the country was necessarily duplicated in Washington.

PENSIONERS SAVED EXPENSE.

In connection with the abolition of the 18 agencies legislation was enacted to pay all pensions from Washington by means of the check voucher system. Hereafter on the date the pension is due the check for the amount of the pension, with a voucher attached, will be mailed to the pensioner. All that need be done to cash the check will be for the pensioner to indorse the check, which is also the receipt, and by having two of his neighbors sign as witnesses the check passes as any bankable paper. The necessity to have the services of a notary public is eliminated. When it is recalled that there are 892,078 persons drawing pensions, a very large number of whom are required to pay at least \$1 a year for notary fees, besides the inconvenience that results from seeking notaries when needed, the advantage in money and comfort to the pensioner, in addition to the efficiency and economy in the administration of the Pension Service, can readily be calculated.

The post-office and river and harbor acts are also increased—the first from \$259,134,463 to \$271,429,599, or \$12,295,136, and the river and harbor act from \$23,855,342 to \$31,059,370.50, or \$7,204,028.50.

The naval act is decreased from \$126,478,338.24 to \$123,220,707.48, a reduction of \$3,257,630.76, while the Army act shows a still greater reduction of \$4,241,352.81, being cut from \$93,374,755.97 to \$89,133,403.16. This latter saving is not for one year only, but under the wise and radical administrative provisions in the act, initiated in the House and pressed to final enactment by the Committee on Military Affairs, the saving will be annual and will undoubtedly prove even larger during each of the next few years. The intervention of a presidential veto defeated other and equally meritorious legislation on this bill.

The act providing for the government of the District of Columbia shows a material reduction from \$12,056,786.50 to \$10,675,833.50, or \$1,380,953, a sum that will go far toward reimbursing the Treasury of the United States the balance due for large sums advanced to make up deficiencies in the District of Columbia revenues, occasioned by lavish and extravagant appropriations of the past few years.

The amount submitted by the Treasury as required under permanent appropriations and carried in the comparative statement of appropriations by this Congress is \$133,058,924.12, as against \$129,575,924.12 for 1912, an increase of \$3,483,000, for which of course the present Congress is in no way accountable. The chief items of increase indicated under permanent appropriations and which almost wholly account for the entire increase are the sums of \$1,175,000 for interest on the public debt increased by the issue of Panama Canal bonds and \$2,000,000, the second annual sum required under the Appalachian Park law for which a sum is now for the first time stated under permanent appropriations.

The legislative, executive, and judicial act, carrying \$34,229,613.38 and providing for the great salary roll of the departmental service at Washington, is reduced from \$35,378,149.85, or a saving of \$1,148,536.47, and several hundred places are permanently dropped from the Government's pay rolls. This act as it passed the House and was subsequently vetoed because it abolished a useless and discredited court, made a reduction of \$2,374,355.79 under the total of like appropriations of the previous year, and also dropped 406 needless employees.

USELESS PUBLIC EMPLOYMENTS.

With an efficient, well-organized working force in the departments at Washington, the whole number of salaried places now provided for could and should be reduced many hundred more. This is very evident, as I have heretofore pointed out in references to the Treasury and War Departments. A provision in this act requires a further reduction in the Treasury Department of 164 statutory offices during this fiscal year in addition to other reductions, which will be discussed later.

ECONOMY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Substantially no new places are provided for by this act in any department; on the other hand, in addition to the reduction in the Treasury, 75 places are abolished, with salaries amounting to nearly \$100,000, in the service of the House of Representatives under its present Democratic organization, and in the War Department it is provided that no vacancies shall be filled until the whole force shall have been reduced by 5 per cent.

NEW BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

Another reform feature effected in this act that will conduce to economy and to greatly increased efficiency by preventing duplication of work in a service vitally affecting the industrial and commercial interests of the country is the consolidation in

the Department of Commerce and Labor of the old Bureau of Manufactures and the Bureau of Statistics under a new and well-equipped bureau, with largely increased and well-defined powers and functions, to be known as the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

This bureau is destined to be one of the most important in the entire Government. Its creation will eventually be recognized as most gratifying constructive legislation. Many good meaning but thoughtless men have been enamored of a tariff board. They have been clamoring that the "tariff be taken out of politics"—as if such a thing were possible. What every sincere man desired was the establishment of some service through which might be obtained accurate information in systematized form relative to the infinite variety of matters affected by tariff legislation, without having such information filter through some intervening body to be colored, or modified, or affected by such a course. In the bureau now established there will be developed a force of statistical experts, apart from the political atmosphere, who will compile the facts upon which legislation may be intelligently based in accordance with the economic theory of the party in control of the Government.

CENTRAL DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Still another measure of economy and increased efficiency provided for is one embraced in section 8, requiring that all of the work incident to the distribution of Government publications shall be made direct from the Government Printing Office. This change has been in contemplation and under discussion for quite a generation, having been suggested for the first time in 1882. The advisability has long been conceded, but for various reasons the reform was not effected. It was stoutly resisted at this session by many officials who disliked to surrender any of the control which they now exercise of this work. As finally worked out it is estimated a saving in expenses of not less than \$250,000 a year will result and the change will contribute in no small degree to increased efficiency and expedition in service.

Hereafter under this legislation there will be a central distributing plant in Washington from which departmental documents shall be shipped. Instead of handling documents several or many times, with large forces scattered through the various departments for such work, it shall all be done from a single office where the volume of business to be handled will make possible the organization and the development of a highly efficient force, and will justify the introduction of many labor and money saving devices which can not be used under the present methods.

CUSTOMS SERVICE TO BE REORGANIZED.

The sundry civil appropriation act, in addition to the large specific reduction of more than \$30,000,000, which it shows under the last law, provides for the most comprehensive and important administrative reform proposed since the Civil War. It will result in an annual saving by a reduction of expenditures of at least \$700,000 per annum, and will insure an increased return from the more efficient administration of the customs service estimated at as high as \$20,000,000 yearly.

The present organization of the customs service is archaic. It dates practically from the beginning of the Government. The service has never been reorganized. As the country developed and expanded new ports and supports of entry have been established. Once established, no matter what the changed conditions, a port is never abolished. The expenses of maintenance is continued regardless of the necessity of the office. A former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, noted for his capacity for organization, expressed the belief that with a proper organization probably 25 per cent of the present cost of the service could be saved. To illustrate the situation, in 1909 it cost twenty-two one-hundredths of a cent to collect a dollar of revenue at the port of New York, where 66 per cent of the customs are paid; at Annapolis, Md., it cost \$309.41; in Alexandria, Va., it cost \$122.49; in Natchez, Miss., it cost \$52.76. In 38 ports it cost more than a dollar to collect a dollar.

At present Congress has practically no control over the expenditures for the collection of customs. Under the act of 1871, section 3687 of the Revised Statutes, \$2,750,000 is appropriated every six months to defray the expense of collecting the customs. This sum is so inadequate, however, that Congress has been appropriating \$5,000,000 additional for several years. For the last fiscal year it cost \$10,850,000.

For many years Congress has been urged to repeal the permanent appropriation of \$5,500,000 annually, to make specific annual appropriations, as it does for almost every other service of the Government, and to reorganize the service by rearranging the districts, readjusting compensations, abolishing useless offices, and adopting modern and up-to-date methods in order that the very best results might be obtained with the least expenditure of money.

In the sundry civil act this has been done. Plenary power has been given to the President to reorganize the service so as to place it upon the most efficient basis possible. After careful investigation it was determined that such results could be accomplished with an expenditure of \$700,000 less than for last year, and a limitation has been placed upon the authority granted, requiring that the reorganized service shall not require an expenditure of more than \$10,150,000 annually.

This saving is not deducted from the appropriations made at this session for the current fiscal year. It will be gained in the next bill, while the Treasury will be further enriched by the increased efficiency in the administration of the customs law. As a part of this reform, the law making the permanent appropriations has been repealed and the submission of detailed estimates for the consideration hereafter by Congress required.

This same power over the internal-revenue districts and service was given to the President in section 3141 of the Revised Statutes. As a result the number of districts was cut in two. The internal revenues are collected, with better-paid officials in charge, for 2.02 per cent of the collections, while the customs duties, with poorer-paid officials in charge, costs 3.03 per cent of the collections, or 50 per cent more than the other service.

Other and equally meritorious, if less conspicuous, measures of reformatory legislation are carried in the general appropriation acts passed this session, namely:

In the legislative act, after surviving two presidential vetoes, the following:

CONGRESS TO CONTROL ESTIMATES FOR EXPENDITURES.

A final section prohibiting the preparation and submission of the annual estimates of appropriations except in the form, and at the time, prescribed by law. This provision was enacted on the well-grounded assumption that Congress knew best the character and extent of the information it desired in responding to the demands of the Executive for appropriations, and because it had enacted a score of well-considered statutes on the subject. It was believed, also, that it would not be wise for Congress to abdicate, even by implication, its prerogative in this matter. A message from the President had already laid before Congress a very full and luminous exposition of the proposed "national budget," and until it could be determined by careful and deliberate study of the scheme whether it should be accepted and adopted, it was not deemed wise or provident to have, as indicated in the public press, the time and energies of large numbers of the most capable persons in the several branches of the public service diverted to transforming the entire estimates for the next fiscal year into this new and unauthorized plan of a so-called national budget, to the neglect of their ordinary and pressing duties. Another consideration of no small moment was the fact that to print the estimates in the proposed new form would cost many thousands of dollars. The printing of the President's message submitting a mere sample of the new proposition alone cost nearly \$4,000.

It was apparent, moreover, that those in the confidence of the President were not either familiar nor in sympathy with the congressional requirements and viewpoint. This is clear from the statement of the President in his message of June 27, 1912, that "the present law governing the preparation and submission of estimates, requiring them to be submitted each year in the same form as the year before, was passed without due consideration as to what information should be laid before Congress as a basis for action, the result being that the unsystematic and confused method before in use was made continuous."

On the contrary the act to which the President refers (June 22, 1906, Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 448) was passed after the most careful consideration. I have personal knowledge of the conditions which made its enactment imperative and I participated in its preparation. The reason for its enactment was to stop a vicious practice which had grown up in the departments of switching estimates in such a manner as to get consideration by committees deemed friendly to the project or service. If permitted to continue it would have placed the work of Congress in chaos and have resulted in a riot of extravagant appropriations that would have staggered an already overburdened Treasury.

DUPLICATION OF WORK PROHIBITED.

Another provision is one regulating the administrative audit of all accounts, under the so-called Dockery law of 1894, so as to break up the rapidly increasing duplication of work in the many disbursing offices. Under a system grown up in those offices, and naturally fostered by the ambitious chiefs thereof, it was disclosed that in one department the disbursing clerk had obtained an organization of upward of 100 clerks and employees with salaries of more than \$100,000 a year, while in another department, expending no less a sum of public money each year, the total force employed did not exceed 10 and their total an-

nual pay was less than \$20,000, and this very office ranks as probably the most efficient of its class in Washington.

In another provision in the body of the act the number of internal-revenue collectors, having maximum salaries of \$4,500 each, is reduced from 67 to 63, after October 1, 1912. The reduction was made because it was demonstrated that there were more than were necessary. The President could have abolished these offices, as he could have abolished the 18 pension agencies. He did not do so. Many messages were received by him upon the question of economy. Action was needed, not talk. "Where, where was Roderick then? One blast upon his bugle horn were worth a thousand men." One order of the President abolishing these useless offices would have had a more beneficial effect upon the public service than all the messages written by Presidents from the beginning of the Government.

INEFFICIENT EMPLOYEES TO BE DISMISSED AND OTHER ECONOMIES ENFORCED.

Section 3 of the act prohibits payment of salaries to persons in the public service incapacitated otherwise than temporarily for performing service, and forbids the payment of compensation out of lump appropriations to persons formerly receiving specific salaries in excess of the rate of such specific salaries. The latter provision is designed to break up an evil practice that has gradually been evolved under which the Government is made to compete against itself, by one department holding out to employees of another department the inducement of pay, out of some lump appropriation, in excess of that he may be receiving under some specific provision of law or appropriation.

Section 4 requires the establishment of three efficiency ratings in the classified service of the departments at Washington, failure to attain which in the first grade prevents promotion, in the second grade requires demotion, and in the third grade provides dismissal; and a severe penalty is provided for all who knowingly violate this law. A fair and honest execution of this law will speedily rid the departmental service of all incompetent persons, the presence of whom is now so frequently the subject of complaint.

Section 5 prescribes a penalty for violation of the act of 1882 prohibiting the employment of persons in the departments at Washington unless specific authority be granted for such employment. This law has been constantly violated and almost continuously so of late years. The hazard of imprisonment it is believed will effectively stop the practice and incidentally save no inconsiderable sum of money each year.

Section 6 prohibits the maintenance at public expense of telephones in private residences or private apartments. The need for such a law was urgently invited by the development of the fact that one high official of the Government at Washington indulged in the extravagance, out of the public purse, of two telephones in his private residence.

On the sundry civil act:

A provision repealing the so-called Tarsney Act, authorizing the employment of outside architects in the construction of public buildings. Experience under this law begot the well-founded criticism that construction was delayed, extravagance encouraged, and the American Institute of Architects required of its members that they charge the United States for services 1 per cent more on the total cost of buildings than was required of individuals.

The Government maintains a well-organized architect's office costing upward of \$1,000,000 a year. In the judgment of three of the committees of the House there was no sound reason for the employment of outside talent under the conditions imposed by the architects by which they charged the United States 20 per centum more than they received from other clients. While the service of the best architectural talent at times is required by the Government, it should and, as experience has shown, can be had upon reasonable terms fair to the Government as well as attractive to the architects.

Another provision stops, until otherwise provided by law, any additional appointments of cadets or cadet engineers in the Revenue-Cutter Service. It costs about \$2,700 per annum to maintain and educate each of the 27 cadets now in the school during the three-year period of their education. As there will be no need for additional officers for several years, this source of needless expense is stopped.

Another provision prohibits the filling of vacancies occurring by death or resignation in the membership of the several commissions in charge of national military parks. There are now 12 of these commissioners and they are paid each \$3,600 per annum. As vacancies occur the duties will gradually be devolved upon the War Department. The administration will be efficient, the expense very much less than at present.

Under the Bureau of Engraving and Printing a permanent provision of law is enacted authorizing the extension of the use of power presses in the work of the bureau. It is estimated that this increased use of power presses will result in

an immediate annual saving of \$140,000, and within five years a total saving per annum of not less than \$600,000. The gain made by this provision has not been taken from the current appropriations, but will be apparent in the next act.

Section 4 prohibits future payments for maintenance of Toro Point Light on the Isthmus of Panama. Such payments have amounted to about \$40,000 per annum in the past. The light serves no useful purpose to our maritime interests. The proprietors of the light hold some sort of questionable or obsolete concession from the Republic of Colombia under which they levy tribute on commerce.

Section 5 provides for a division of records for the Panama Canal in order to preserve permanently the engineering records and history of the canal construction. The assembling and arrangement of these records at this time is a matter of the greatest importance and is indispensable to the future efficient operation and economical maintenance of the canal.

Section 6 requires the submission, following all lump-sum estimates for appropriations exceeding \$250,000, of comparative statements disclosing the purposes for which previous like sums were expended and details of how the expenditures are intended to be made under the estimates. This will give not only to the committees charged with preparing appropriation bills but to the membership of the House and the entire public a graphic showing of expenditures made and those in contemplation.

Section 7 provides that no appropriation hereafter made by Congress shall be held to be continuing and expendable beyond the year for which it is made, unless it shall be so declared in explicit terms. By construction of accounting officers many appropriations have in the past been defined as permanent and continuing when they were never so intended by Congress in making them. Permanent appropriations, even those designedly made, are not conducive to economy or efficiency in administration and, what is more important, to a reasonable knowledge on the part of Congress of how the public money is being expended each year.

Section 8 requires certain officers and employees of the United States to administer without additional pay oaths to expense accounts of public officials. This will retrench expenses about \$60,000 per annum.

On the District of Columbia act:

Section 9 prohibits any expenditures for fees or dues of any officer or employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia for membership in any society or association or for expenses of attendance at any meeting of members of any society or association unless express provision is made for such expenditures. Except as to payment of fees or dues the provisions of this section are not to be operative during the current fiscal year. This is to permit the consideration of estimates at the next session so that provision may be made thereunder for specific cases where Congress may determine it proper and necessary to provide for expenses of attendance at meetings of the character in question.

Section 9 makes the provisions of the antideficiency law applicable to expenditures for the government of the District of Columbia. This law, as applied to the expenses of the General Government, has literally resulted in the saving of millions of dollars.

NO NEW AVENUES TO THE TREASURY.

It will be observed that the purpose of each and every one of these "substantive" provisions of law have for their chief objects economy in expenditures and the promotion of efficiency in the public service, and that none are designed to establish new or to enlarge and foster old avenues to the Treasury.

They are all provisions highly beneficial to the public service. Their enactment will save to the Treasury many millions annually, and very greatly improve the administration of the public service. They are all "legislation on appropriation bills," so much condemned by thoughtless, ignorant, or designing persons during this session of Congress.

As a result of their enactment, however, the Democratic House has been able to work many reforms in the public service, despite a hostile Senate and Executive, from whom it received no material aid and very slight encouragement.

A change in the method of printing the legislative, executive, and judicial, sundry civil, and general deficiency appropriation bills was instituted by the Committee on Appropriations at this session by expressing all sums of money in them in figures instead of spelling them out at length as heretofore. The change seems to have met with universal commendation. An estimate by the Public Printer shows that the new method has resulted in a saving of not less than \$5,563.60 and a diminution of 134 pages in all of the four or more editions of the three bills and 67 pages of the volume of the Statutes at Large when it is published.

If this method is applied to the other 11 regular appropriation bills a total saving will result of not less than \$10,000 per

annum and, what is even quite as desirable, the volume of the annual statutes will be reduced by quite 150 pages.

THE LAW OF ESTIMATES EVADED.

Under the act of March 4, 1909, the Secretary of the Treasury is required immediately after the receipt of the regular annual estimates of appropriations for the various branches of the public service to estimate as nearly as may be the revenues of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year; and if the estimates for appropriations, including the estimated amount necessary to meet all continuing and permanent appropriations, shall exceed the estimated revenues, he is commanded to transmit the estimates to Congress, as previously required by law, and after that to transmit a detailed statement of all of said estimates to the President, to the end that he may, in giving Congress information of the state of the Union, advise how in his judgment the estimated appropriations could with least injury to the public service be reduced so as to bring the appropriations within the estimated revenues, or, if such reduction be not in his judgment practicable without undue injury to the public service, that he may recommend to Congress such loans or new taxes as may be necessary to cover the deficiency.

The President has never complied with this law in letter or in spirit. The Secretary of the Treasury, who is an officer of Congress and subject to its will, in a measure that does not apply to the head of any other executive department, has ignored it in a manner that deserves the severest criticism.

In order to make a showing of pretended economy on the part of the administration, an order has gone forth, written or verbal, that no estimate shall be transmitted to Congress, by its own officer, the Secretary of the Treasury, and notwithstanding the law to the contrary, until the same has been authorized by the President. Under this unlawful proceeding Congress has been denied the real estimates prepared by the departments; in some cases items have been wholly suppressed, in others estimates based upon ascertained legal requirements have been wantonly reduced, for the purpose of arbitrarily bringing the total of estimates within a certain amount. As proof of this assertion I quote from Secretary of the Navy Meyer's letter transmitting, after the regular annual estimates had been sent to this Congress, an estimate of \$1,000,000 for the Naval Service:

This item was not included in the original estimates submitted to you for transmission to Congress, as the department was desirous of keeping the total of estimates to as low a figure as possible.

Brig. Gen. Henry G. Sharpe, Commissary General of the Army, in appearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations charged with the preparation of the general deficiency bill, made the following statements with reference to the estimates of appropriations for subsistence of the United States Army:

The CHAIRMAN. When you submitted your estimates for the current fiscal year for subsistence, did you give the number of rations on which you figured?

Gen. SHARPE. The number of rations is stated there.

The CHAIRMAN. And you estimated them at 21.87 cents each?

Gen. SHARPE. When we first submitted it, we figured the ration at 23 cents each; but we were directed to reduce the estimate by \$534,000, and the only way to reduce was to reduce the price of the rations.

The CHAIRMAN. Why were you directed to reduce the estimate?

Gen. SHARPE. Those were the instructions of the Secretary of War. We were told to cut it down \$534,000.

The CHAIRMAN. I remember the statement was made that the amount appropriated would be inadequate.

Gen. SHARPE. I made that statement, and it was inadequate. We will not have enough for next year, and I am coming up before you again next year, Mr. Chairman, for the same reason.

Brig. Gen. George R. Smith, Paymaster General of the Army, in appearing before the same subcommittee in support of estimates for a deficiency in the appropriations for the pay of officers and enlisted men of the Army, testified as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. You have a deficiency of \$1,800,000?

Gen. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Your estimate was \$44,959,442.95?

Gen. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the appropriation was \$44,625,042.95. What was your original estimate as transmitted to the Secretary?

Gen. SMITH. The original estimate was cut in the office of the Secretary of War \$1,550,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know why that was?

Gen. SMITH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your estimate based on?

Gen. SMITH. It was based on the strength of the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. And then Congress appropriated about \$334,400 less than the estimate submitted by the Secretary?

Gen. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that makes practically the \$1,800,000 that you now need?

Gen. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the estimates from your office had been transmitted to Congress and that amount provided there would have been no deficiency?

Gen. SMITH. No, sir; I think we would have gotten through pretty nicely.

The Secretary of the Treasury, well aware of the established policy of Congress to make each year specific appropriations

for construction of public buildings, submitted at the beginning of this session a lump sum of \$3,000,000 coupled with the suggestion that he be clothed with the discretion to apply that sum, and all unexpended balances of previous specific appropriations for buildings, to such of the hundreds of authorized structures as he might designate. By this unwarranted and unusual method of submitting estimates a further apparent, but fictitious, reduction of \$10,234,201.20 was made in the sum total of the estimates submitted at the beginning of the session, and to that extent he further contributed to the deception of the public as to the real amount of estimated expenditures proposed by the Executive.

Notwithstanding all of this avoidance of the plain intent of the law by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, the former has, in another and more serious particular, failed to comply with a further important requirement of this enactment, namely, that he should in the event the estimated appropriations exceeded the estimated revenues—

advise the Congress how in his judgment the estimated appropriations could with least injury to the public be reduced so as to bring the appropriations within the estimated revenues or, if such reduction be not in his judgment practicable without undue injury to the public service, that he may recommend to Congress such loans or new taxes as may be necessary to cover the deficiency.

The annual estimates submitted to Congress as required by law in December last, even after shamefully juggling them as I have shown, amounted to \$1,006,773,026.55; at the same time the total estimated revenues from all sources amounted to only \$927,938,463, a discrepancy of \$78,834,563.55, which, it was designed by the law, the President should aid the Congress with advice and counsel how to overcome by cutting down, or by laying new taxes, or borrowing money. Instead it remained for this House, controlled by the Democratic Party, by its own unaided efforts to solve in a large measure the problem by cutting the President's estimates \$40,135,284.54 in the annual bills as they were sent to a Republican Senate. Not only did the President fail in his lawful duty to aid this House in the weary task he set before them of reducing his excessive and extravagant estimates, but he added to the perplexity of the situation by thrusting upon them from time to time, with his written approval, supplemental estimates amounting to \$16,675,000 and deficiency estimates for \$19,200,000 more.

The action of the Executive in making arbitrary reductions in estimates of appropriations whose necessary amounts are so patently capable of actual computation before they are submitted to Congress is grossly misleading to the Congress and to the people of the country, and demonstrates most conclusively that it was made, not with a view of effecting economy in expenditures, but with the bold intention of misrepresenting to the Nation the amounts of its money which would be required for the support of the Government. The revelation of these facts will, I am sure, raise a doubt in the minds of the public at large as to the sincerity of the administration in its protestations of retrenchment.

It makes idle all discussion of a so-called "National Budget" when such practices are adopted, and the failure to obey the existing laws relative to the submission of estimates more than all else contributes to the difficulties of those charged with the responsibilities of preparing the supply bills.

GROWTH OF APPROPRIATIONS CHECKED.

It should be observed that the appropriations made at this session are materially less than the appropriations made at either of the last three regular sessions, namely:

Less than those of the last session in providing for the fiscal year 1912 by \$7,046,738.06.

Less than those of the previous session in providing for the fiscal year 1911 by \$8,265,285.52.

Less than those of the session which provided for the fiscal year 1910 by \$8,870,427.28.

To have checked the abnormal and rapid growth of appropriations is in itself no mean achievement for this House, and to have made the indicated reductions with the encouragement that the lavish appropriations Republican Congresses had given to those seeking aid from the Federal Treasury was a task almost impossible of accomplishment.

In addition to the considerable excess of direct appropriations made at the last session of the last Congress over those of this session, contract obligations were also authorized at that time, for further expenditures, in the sum of \$43,454,145 as against \$22,711,400, authorized at this session for similar contract liabilities, thus constituting another comparison favorable to this Congress as against its immediate Republican predecessor to the extent of \$20,742,745, which, added to the reduction we have made in specific appropriations, makes a combined reduction under appropriations and liabilities of the last session of \$27,789,483.06.

These contract authorizations are frequently made to satisfy the desires of those seeking legislation, but who are content to obtain the authority even if the appropriation be deferred. The result, however, is to burden succeeding Congresses with the obligation to appropriate to carry out these authorizations and frequently to cause criticism for results which were inevitable under laws previously enacted.

PLEDGES KEPT.

This review demonstrates that the pledges of the Democratic Party have been kept. Substantial reductions in expenditures have been made, and comprehensive reforms that will bring about substantial reductions hereafter and greatly improve the efficiency of the public service have been effected and many activities of the Government extended, while new services have been initiated, without denying to any service a single dollar required for its legitimate needs.

NAVAL EFFICIENCY MAINTAINED.

An attempt has been made to mislead the public into the belief that the economies effected have been at the expense of the Naval Establishment. Knowledge of the facts makes the attempt ridiculous. During this session more has been done to put the fleet upon an effective fighting basis than in any session of Congress in my service.

Congress provided 1 first-class battleship, 2 fuel ships, 6 torpedo-boat destroyers, 8 submarine torpedo boats, 1 tender to destroyers, 1 submarine tender, 4,000 additional enlisted men, 400 marines, 13 marine officers, 30 paymasters, authority to modernize the guns, projectiles, and other facilities of existing

battleships so as to make them more effective. Provision was made to enlarge the dry dock in Hawaii, to establish a worldwide wireless system, to establish coal depots for the fleet, to organize a Dental Corps and a Medical Corps.

All of these matters are of the utmost importance if the ships and men already provided are to be effective as a fighting force.

During this session I have had the hearty cooperation of all of the members of this committee, for which I am very grateful. The best indication of the effectiveness of their work is the fact that, with the exception of the pension appropriation act, which carries more money than the act of last year because of the legislation granting liberal increases of pensions to Civil and Mexican War veterans, every other appropriation bill over which the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction when enacted into law carried, in a marked degree, less money than the preceding act.

What has been done this session is merely an illustration of what may be accomplished if the Democratic Party is given that opportunity which only comes with full control of the Government. What has been accomplished resulted from persistent efforts and unmeasured determination.

We ask an intelligent and impartial judgment upon accomplished results; we believe it justifies the continuance and the enlargement of our power in the Government.

The following table gives in the customary form a complete history of the appropriation bills for this session of Congress, beginning with the estimates submitted by the Executive and following the course of each bill through to its final approval:

History of appropriation bills, second session of the Sixty-second Congress; estimates and appropriations for the fiscal year 1912-13; and appropriations for the fiscal year 1911-12.

[Prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.]

Title.	Estimates, 1913.	Reported to the House.	Passed the House.	Reported to the Senate.	Passed the Senate.	Law, 1912-13.	Law, 1911-12.
		Amount.	Amount.	Amount.	Amount.	Amount.	Amount.
Agriculture.....	\$17,233,452.00	\$15,836,976.00	\$15,933,366.00	\$17,056,976.00	\$18,111,976.00	\$16,651,496.00	\$16,900,016.00
Army (vetoed).....		(88,854,267.18)	(87,777,257.18)	(95,314,710.98)	(95,343,510.98)	(90,654,562.98)	
Army ¹	96,927,988.98	89,127,257.18	89,127,257.18	95,302,630.98	95,478,380.98	90,483,403.16	93,374,755.97
Diplomatic and consular.....	4,079,697.41	3,427,491.41	3,418,791.41	3,788,347.11	3,790,847.41	3,638,047.41	3,988,516.41
District of Columbia ²	12,954,720.50	10,302,208.00	10,300,858.00	12,008,014.50	11,864,524.50	10,675,833.50	12,056,788.50
Fortification.....	7,218,899.00	4,036,235.00	4,036,235.00	4,186,235.00	4,186,235.00	4,036,235.00	5,473,707.00
Indian.....	8,517,440.00	7,475,255.00	7,516,255.00	12,436,197.99	14,600,294.00	9,854,184.46	8,842,136.37
Legislative (vetoed).....		(33,519,594.00)	(33,782,854.00)	(34,537,894.50)	(34,476,154.50)	(34,187,591.16)	
Legislative (vetoed).....		(33,651,084.00)	(33,651,084.00)	(34,240,591.16)	(34,187,591.16)	(34,187,591.16)	
Legislative, etc. ³	35,684,267.40	34,229,613.38	34,229,613.38	34,229,613.38	34,229,613.38	34,229,613.38	35,378,149.85
Military Academy.....	1,804,928.63	1,033,860.26	1,034,260.26	1,064,608.26	1,064,608.26	1,064,608.26	1,163,424.07
Navy.....	126,186,943.46	118,809,337.76	118,551,437.76	133,009,674.28	133,590,174.48	123,220,707.48	126,478,333.24
Pension.....	152,687,750.00	152,579,000.00	152,579,000.00	165,186,750.00	165,187,750.00	165,146,145.84	153,682,000.00
Post Office ⁴	200,938,463.00	202,206,999.00	203,073,749.00	273,158,820.00	273,642,303.00	271,429,599.00	259,134,463.00
River and harbor.....	* 17,345,450.00	24,062,520.50	24,062,520.50	31,853,530.50	31,883,530.50	* 31,659,370.50	* 23,855,342.00
Sundry civil.....	* 131,896,602.05	109,577,414.40	109,567,974.40	115,021,989.70	116,322,730.20	* 112,039,184.40	* 142,265,044.14
Total.....	\$73,566,602.43	\$32,098,167.89	\$33,431,817.89	\$99,654,447.70	\$93,953,033.77	\$73,628,498.39	\$82,592,679.55
Urgent deficiency 1912 and prior years.....		2,364,756.46	2,364,756.46	2,922,756.46	3,188,627.46	2,457,756.46	
Deficiency 1912 and prior years.....	¹¹ 19,200,000.00	6,182,838.24	6,185,238.24	11,513,871.26	11,700,845.75	7,243,474.69	9,740,971.24
Total.....	\$92,766,602.43	\$41,245,762.59	\$41,981,812.59	\$114,091,075.42	\$118,840,506.98	\$83,329,719.54	\$92,333,650.79
Miscellaneous.....	¹² 14,675,000.00					¹³ 3,200,000.00	4,773,308.81
Total regular annual appropriations.....	907,441,602.43					\$86,429,719.54	\$97,106,957.60
Permanent annual appropriations.....	¹² 133,206,424.12					¹² 133,206,424.12	129,575,924.12
Grand total, regular and permanent annual appropriations.....	1,040,648,026.55					¹⁴ 1,019,636,143.66	¹⁴ 1,026,682,881.72

Amount of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1913.....

Amount of estimated postal revenues for fiscal year 1913.....

\$967,030,032.02

280,933,463.03

Total of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1913.....

927,933,463.00

¹ The Army and the legislative bills for 1913 as originally passed were vetoed by the President June 17 and Aug. 15 and 21, 1912, respectively. In order to preserve their history, the several dates of their consideration are noted, and amounts carried are indicated in parentheses, but the amounts (in parentheses) of the vetoed bills are not included in any of the totals stated herein.

² This amount includes \$1,350,000 appropriated in a joint resolution, approved July 8, 1912, for the Organized Militia, a like sum having been carried by the Army act which was vetoed, and omitted from the Army act finally approved.

³ One-half of the amounts for the District of Columbia payable by the United States, except amounts for the water department (estimated for 1913 at \$135,785), which are payable from the revenues of the water department.

⁴ Includes all expenses of the postal service payable from postal revenues and out of the Treasury.

⁵ In addition to this amount the sum of \$12,114,988 to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvement is included in the sundry civil estimates for 1913.

⁶ In addition to this amount the sum of \$9,500,250 to meet contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements is included in the sundry civil act for 1913.

⁷ In addition to this amount the sum of \$7,025,077 was appropriated in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements for 1912.

⁸ This amount includes \$12,114,988 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$47,283,760.20 for construction and fortification of the Isthmian Canal for 1913.

⁹ This amount includes \$9,500,250 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$31,786,950 for construction of the Isthmian Canal for 1912.

¹⁰ This amount includes \$7,025,077 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and \$48,500,000 for the construction and fortification of the Isthmian Canal for 1912.

¹¹ This amount is approximated.

¹² This is the amount submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual estimates for the fiscal year 1913, the exact amount appropriated not being ascertainable until two years after the close of the fiscal year. This amount includes estimated amount of \$60,650,000 to meet sinking-fund obligations for 1913.

¹³ In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the fortification act, \$371,407; by the naval act, \$20,140,000; by the river and harbor act, \$2,200,000; in all, \$22,711,407.

¹⁴ In addition to this amount contracts are authorized to be entered into, subject to future appropriations by Congress, as follows: By the naval act, \$33,332,500; and by the river and harbor act, \$13,101,645; in all, \$46,434,145.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, appropriation bills have their origination in the House of Representatives. The Republican House at its last session in 1911 originated the appropriations for the public service for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1911, and ending June 30, 1912. The Democratic House at this session of Congress originated appropriations for the year beginning July 1, 1912, and ending June 30, 1913. It is proper at this time to make a comparison between the appropriations for the two fiscal years.

Many have been the promises of economy, and much has been said on the floor of this House and elsewhere about the accomplishments of the Democratic Party with respect to its ability to reduce the annual running expenses of the Government.

In its Baltimore platform that party denounces what it terms the "profligate waste" of the people's money through "lavish appropriations" of Republican Congresses, and declares for a return to Democratic simplicity and the abolishment of useless offices.

APPROPRIATIONS EXCEED THOSE OF LAST YEAR.

The total amount, including permanent appropriations, granted at the last session of the last Congress when the Republican House had charge of appropriation bills, was \$1,026,682,881.72.

The stated total amount, including permanent appropriations at this session by origination in a Democratic House, is \$1,019,636,143.66.

In consideration of these two great totals it is proper to state that all money expended for the construction of the Panama Canal is reimbursable to the Treasury of the United States through the sale of bonds already authorized for that purpose, and since these sums are not a burden upon the revenues of the country they should, for purposes of comparison, be eliminated from the total amounts appropriated. A Republican House at the last session of Congress provided for this great canal the sum of \$45,560,000, and through the requirements of the law making these appropriations continue available until they are finally expended, there remained in the Treasury at the end of the last year amounts of money exceeding \$5,000,000 for canal construction, which made it possible for the Democratic House to reduce, as they have, the sums for the canal for next year to \$28,980,000.

Therefore, deducting the \$45,560,000 for canal construction from the total appropriations last year of \$1,026,682,881.72, there remains an aggregate of \$981,122,881.72, and deducting the \$28,980,000 for canal construction from the total amounts made at this session there remains an aggregate of \$990,656,143.66, a sum which exceeds the grand total of all appropriations made by the Republican House at the last session of last Congress by \$9,533,261.94.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman thinks that those things that do not come out of the ordinary receipts of the Government should be eliminated?

Mr. CANNON. I think the Panama Canal should be.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, why not the Post Office expenditures? They are paid for out of the postal receipts. That would make a difference of \$11,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, there is a permanent appropriation appropriating the post-office receipts. It is a part of the permanent appropriations, and has been for a quarter of a century.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just one other thing: The gentleman, although he eliminates appropriations, incorporates over \$1,000,000 additional of permanent appropriations, as the result of the sale of Panama bonds last year.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; and \$2,000,000 of permanent appropriations for the Appalachian Park.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken. I eliminate the Panama proposition; and all other appropriations are either appropriations for the ordinary expenses or permanent appropriations authorized by law.

Now, having stated that much, lo and behold, what happened? I will print this statement in full, and I am merely explaining two or three things, hitting a dry place here and hitting a dry place there. Six million dollars is the amount of the deficiency bill to make up the deficiencies where the appropriations fell short—the appropriations that were made by the last Republican Congress. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] states—and tells us the truth—that that is the smallest deficiency that has been passed since 1886. That is true. That shows how efficiently the work was done by the last session of the last Republican Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Then there is another thing. The gentleman, although he may be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—and I hope he will be, and he deserves to be, so long as you have the Democratic House [applause] for his intelligence, his industry, and his honesty and fidelity—although he might preside over that committee for years to come, he never would report as small a deficiency bill as he has reported this year. [Applause on the Republican side.] He has reported a deficiency bill this year that cares for all matters of deficiency of the past year.

Why, gentlemen, the regular estimate for pensions, made before the late pension legislation was enacted, was \$153,000,000. That was given; but since that time new pension legislation has been enacted, and, in round numbers, 500,000 claims are now pending and are being rapidly, and will be more rapidly, disposed of, as the weeks come and go. Now, they increased the appropriation on that account from \$153,000,000 to \$165,000,000. There is enough money appropriated to pay pensions until after the election, and more than enough [laughter on the Republican side]; but the gentleman will report a bill carrying at least \$20,000,000 in addition to pay pensions for the present fiscal year.

There are various other matters of deficiency. I expect, if the Lord spares me, to be present at the last session of this Congress, to see the gentleman report a bill or bills before the 4th day of next March appropriating \$30,000,000 for deficiencies that ought to be carried by this bill. How? Why, the country grows. Thank God, it grows. We legislate for increasing appropriations. Thank God, we do so legislate. I never want to see the time when appropriations will drop back. I want to see them increase, to meet the necessities of a growing and an advancing civilization. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, my statement is in manuscript, and I resume the reading of the same at the point where I was interrupted by my friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

DEFICIENCIES IN PENSIONS AND OTHER APPROPRIATIONS WILL RESULT.

In presenting to the House the general deficiency bill, providing deficiencies for the fiscal year 1912, for which fiscal year appropriations had been made by a Republican Congress and approved by a Republican President, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated that it was the smallest deficiency bill that had been presented to the House since 1886. The minority of this House is grateful to the chairman of that committee for the merited compliment that he has paid to the preceding Republican administration of the House. The fact that the general deficiency bill is the smallest in a quarter of a century is an evidence of the thoroughness with which the appropriation bills were prepared and considered by a Republican House and a tribute to the manner in which the public service has been handled and the money expended. One thing, more than any other, that has made possible this remarkable statement on the part of the chairman of the committee is the antideficiency law, initiated in 1906 by the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Hon. James A. Tawney, and passed by a Republican House, and which for the first time in the history of our Government successfully raised a barrier against the expenditure of any money not authorized by law. It is well that he makes this statement at this time, for he is in the only position to make it he will ever be in.

It is fortunate indeed for him that his first general deficiency bill follows acts which judiciously provided for all branches of the public service, for when the appropriations made at this session have been allotted to the governmental departments and establishments they will fall so far short that in presenting to the next session of this Congress the bills providing for deficiencies he will be able to make the further remarkable statement that the deficiency bill is the largest ever brought into the House since 1886. I make this statement advisedly and call the attention of the House to the estimate of \$152,687,750 for the payment of pensions, made prior to the enactment of the recent pension law. The appropriation made for the payment of pensions for this year is \$165,146,145.84. Already under the legislation increasing pensions there have been filed, in round numbers, one-half million claims, which, it is hoped, will be rapidly adjudicated, and I have no doubt that it will increase the appropriation for pensions over and above the amount appropriated for this year by at least requiring a deficiency appropriation for pensions of \$20,000,000.

The policy of the Democratic House has been to decrease the appropriations as largely as possible prior to the election in November next, and for the purpose of claiming Democratic

economy; but the legislation of this Congress, coupled with the growth of the country and the legitimate demands of the public service, will compel the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, when Congress meets in December next to report deficiency bills during that session to cover appropriations which should have been made at this session for at least \$30,000,000 for the public service during this fiscal year, and which have been withheld for the purpose of establishing a fallacious claim of Democratic economy.

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR ANTITRUST PROSECUTIONS.

The Democratic Party, in its platform adopted at Baltimore, announced to the country that it favored the vigorous enforcement of the criminal as well as civil law against trusts and trust officials. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of demands by Members on the Democratic side of the House during this session for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. The truth is that during this administration, and especially during this year, greater progress has been successfully made in the enforcement of the laws upon the statute books against trusts than since the enactment of the antitrust law in 1890. The last report of the Attorney General shows that during the fiscal year 1911 there was collected and paid into the Treasury in fines around \$4,204,115.51, which is \$980,341.62 more than was expended for that year for the Department of Justice and all the special attorneys employed in the various prosecutions. The estimate submitted by the Attorney General for the enforcement of these laws for this fiscal year was \$300,000; the amount appropriated was \$200,000. Professions are one thing; action is another thing.

In the appropriations for the enforcement of the commerce acts the necessary amount was decreased from \$25,000 to \$10,000.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

The Howard University, at Washington, is the only university supported in part by the Federal Treasury for the training of the colored race. It has done and is doing splendid work in educating and training practical young men and women who go out after their training for the instruction of those of their race. A new dormitory was shown to be, in my judgment, necessary and various improvements requiring Federal appropriations, and they were not made.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

St. Elizabeth, the insane hospital, not only for the people of the District of Columbia but for the soldiers and sailors and veterans of the War of the Rebellion who are cared for in that great institution, needs appropriations for extension and for the security of patients there, and they were also withheld.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

The Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service estimated \$500,000 for the prevention of epidemics, and in view of our extended coast lines, the bubonic plague, the yellow fever, and other dangerous diseases, this amount should have been granted. The appropriation made was for \$200,000 and every effort to increase the same was successfully combated by a Democratic House.

IMMIGRATION SERVICE.

Almost a million of immigrants come to this country annually, very largely from Europe. Necessary funds, especially for the immigration station at New York, were denied. This service is of vast importance for the security of the people of the United States and for the efficient enforcement of the law, and this, too, although the head tax that is collected from immigrants coming to the United States far exceeded the expenditures necessary for the service.

DEMOCRATIC FAILURE.

Time does not allow the further specifying of the failure of the Democratic House to appropriate properly for the public service, of which there are many scores of other instances that might properly be made, nor does the condition of the United States warrant the withholding of necessary appropriations. Under Republican revenue laws enacted by Republican Congresses the surplus revenues after the payment of all expenditures for the last fiscal year were \$37,224,501.90, and the receipts so far this fiscal year justify me in predicting a surplus of \$50,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. I make this prediction absolutely sure of fulfillment if the present production and prosperity of the country continues until the 1st day of July, 1913.

Mr. Speaker, verily, verily, say I unto you, the Democratic Party whenever given partial or complete power have heretofore

and continue to thunder in the index and do not perform in the text.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 25970. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 7500. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes," approved July 22, 1912.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 25970. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 and for prior years, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States a sum equal to one-twelfth of their annual salaries in lieu of transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate of the United States a sum equal to one-twelfth of their salaries, in lieu of all transportation and other expenses in coming to and returning from Washington for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On August 24, 1912:

H. R. 21279. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

On August 26, 1912:

H. R. 25970. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1912 and prior years, and for other purposes.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The hour fixed in the concurrent resolution for final adjournment is about to arrive. The Speaker desires to congratulate the membership of the House on having reached the end of one of the longest and most laborious sessions in the history of Congress. There are a few sessions which have exceeded this in length, counting from the first Monday in December until the close, but I believe that a careful examination of the RECORD would show that Congress has been actually in session more days since the first Monday in December than any other Congress that ever sat. [Applause.]

The Speaker desires to thank all the Members of the House, on both sides of the big aisle, which, when he was sworn in to the office of Speaker, he said separates us politically but not as friends or patriots, for the uniform courtesy with which they have treated the Speaker. If the administration of that great office in the present Speaker's hands has been successful, it is largely due to the assistance he has received from the Members of this House.

I hope that we shall all reach home safely and find our loved ones well; that we shall all have an enjoyable vacation and return on the first Monday of next December refreshed and invigorated for the work that will lie before us. [Applause.]

And now, in accordance with the provisions of the concurrent resolution, I declare the second session of the Sixty-second Congress adjourned without day.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 26450) granting an increase of pension to Milton Trout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 26451) for the relief of Daniel W. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 26452) granting a pension to Sarah Whidden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 26453) granting an increase of pension to Helen Grierson Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition of citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Petition of the Calhoun County (Ark.) Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, relative to lands from which natural fertilizers can be mined; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of W. S. Hancock Council, No. 20, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.